THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

ASPECTS OF SOCIAL LIFE IN ANTIOCH IN THE HELLENISTIC-ROMAN PERIOD

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF ORIENTAL LANGUAGES
AND LITERATURES

BY

GEORGE HADDAD

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
SEPTEMBER, 1949

PREFACE

These studies consist of two main parts, both necessary as a basis for any further study of the social life of Antioch in the Hellenistic-Roman period, and for the problem of the Hellenization of the East. The first part bears on the population of Antioch from its foundation in 300 B.C., until late Roman times. The second is on the character of that population. The present writer has felt that the problem of the population of Antioch has hardly been touched, whether by the general works on the Hellenistic-Roman age, or by the few works devoted to Antioch. Similarly, the character of the population has usually been dismissed with the same customary statements told in a rather one-sided spirit.

In this essay, we have, on the one hand, attempted to help solve the problem of the origins, different elements, race, nationality, and language of the population of Antioch during a period extending over eight centuries, and, on the other hand, we have tried to correct the traditional views of the character of the people by putting this problem in its right historical setting. Our task has been the more difficult because the soil of Antioch has not yielded either papyri, parchments, or even the necessary quantity of dated inscriptions which make the study of other countries and cities in that same period relatively easy and more fruitful. We have used the epigraphic material at our disposal from Antioch and the surrounding country. And we have had to resort to the laborious task of looking for testimonies related to the question of the population and its character in a

wide range of authors, extending over ten centuries and including all kinds of works, general history, church history, chronicles, biography, geography, homilies, orations, correspondence, satires, and poetry. We hope that we have helped throw more light on these highly debatable questions, and by so doing that we have furthered the study of the Hellenistic Near East in at least one of its aspects.

The writer takes the pleasure of acknowledging his heavy debt to Professor Ralph Marcus for his kind encouragement and valuable advice throughout the period of study and research on this subject, and for his generous help in explaining many an obscure passage in the Greek original. He would also like to thank Professors R. A. Bowman and A. J. Wilson for their valuable advice and help. The writer owes a great debt of gratitude to the authorities of the Syrian Ministry of Education, and of the Syrian University in Damascus for granting him a leave of absence to pursue his studies in The University of Chicago, and to bring this work to a successful end.

George Haddad

Chicago, May 13, 1949.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

PREFACE ii

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTORY: ANTIOCH THE EXTRAORDINARY CITY . . . 1

Name, Foundation, Geographical Importance
Political, Administrative, and Military Significance
Economic Importance and Wealth of Antioch
Titles and Rank of Antioch
Other Aspects of the Importance of Antioch

II. THE POPULATION OF ANTIOCH: ORIGINS AND SIZE 38

The First Inhabitants of Antioch
The Evolution of the Population During the Seleucid and Roman Periods
The Size of the Population of Antioch

III. THE POPULATION OF ANTIOCH: THE PROBLEMS OF RACE, NATIONALITY, AND LANGUAGE 74

The Question of Race and Nationality
The Personal Names of the Antiochenes
The Language of the Antiochenes
The Race and Nationality of the Antiochenes

IV. THE CHARACTER OF THE ANTIOCHENE POPULATION THE SO-CALLED FICKLE, SATIRIC, AND RIOTOUS CHARACTER OF THE ANTIOCHENES 122

The Fickle and Unreliable Antiochenes
The Satiric and Laughter-Loving Antiochenes
The Riotous and Insurrection-Loving Antiochenes

V. THE CHARACTER OF THE ANTIOCHENE POPULATION THE SO-CALLED PLEASURE-LOVING AND DISSOLUTE CHARACTER OF THE ANTIOCHENES 153

Luxurious Living and Love of Feasts
Licentiousness and Dissoluteness in the Institutions of Social Life
Effeminacy and Immorality
The Truth about the Character of the Antiochenes

BIBLIOGRAPHY 187

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY

ANTIOCH THE EXTRAORDINARY CITY

Antioch, compared by some scholars to the Paris of modern times in its splendor and its character,[1] and to Vienna in being the melting pot of eastern and western cultures,[2] was a city of extraordinary importance, and of unusual character. This is what we shall try to show in this introductory chapter, before discussing the elements of its population, and before giving an estimate and an explanation of the character of its inhabitants in the following chapters, judging that a good comprehension of the manifold aspects of its importance and character, especially as viewed by ancient writers, will help us understand the problems connected with its population, its social life, and the character of its people.

Name, Foundation, Geographical Importance

Antioch stands at the head of a list of several Antiocheias founded chiefly by Seleucus Nicator, and by some of the other

---

[1] C. O. Müller, Antiquitates Antiochenae (Göttingen, 1839), p. 68, writing in 1839 in the days of the bourgeois monarchy of Louis Philippe, says: "Antioch under Pompey was not surpassed in magnitude by Paris of our times." Reverend Blomfield Jackson in connection with the revolt of 387 in Antioch speaks of the city as "the oriental Paris of the fourth century" (Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, 2d series, III [New York, 1892] 145, n. 3, in his translation of Theodoret).

[2] Bruce M. Metzger, "Antioch-on-the-Orontes," The Biblical Archaeologist, XI (1948), 87.

Seleucids.[1] To its loyal son, Libanius, writing in 360 A.D., Antioch was the city par excellence, for "Seleucus did not build many cities like it, the others were like servants to the city where he had his residence" (ὥσπερ θεραπαίνας αὐτῇ τὰς ἄλλας).[2] It was neither the outcome of a Macedonian military settlement (Katoikia), nor the baptism of an already existing famous city under a new name. It rose, so to speak, from the ground; its human material, its building, and its name had to be furnished.[3]

The city was said to have been founded by Seleucus Nicator on the 22nd of Artemisius (roughly May) 300 B.C. in the first hour of the day at the rising of the sun. Our most reliable authorities point out Seleucus' father, Antiochus, as the one in whose honor the city was named,[4] although a few authorities speak

---

[1]Stephanus of Byzantium Ethnica, ed. August Meineke (Berlin, 1849), pp. 99-100, mentions fourteen cities by the name of Antiocheia, but he places "that of the Syrians" at the head of his list (πρώτη Σύρων) and says that few other towns were also known by that name. Appian Roman History, ed. and trans. Horace White, Loeb Classical Library (4 vols.; London: W. Heinemann; New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1912-1913), xi. 57 relates that sixteen out of the sixty cities built by Seleucus Nicator were called Antioch. I. Benzinger, "Antiocheia," Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft (hereafter referred to as RE), ed. Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll, Vol. I (1894), mentions no less than twenty-two Antiocheias.

[2]Libanius Antiochicus or Oration xi. 4 in Libanius' Works, ed. Richard Foerster (12 vols.; Leipzig: Teubner, 1903-1912), I, 470.

[3]For a detailed discussion of the different types of city foundations and the necessary steps in each foundation see V. Tscherikower, Die hellenistischen Städtegründungen von Alexander dem Grossen bis auf die Römerzeit. Supplement Band XIX, Heft I of Philologus (Leipzig, 1927), p. 116. The human material was partly a result of synoecism as we shall see.

[4]Strabo The Geography xvi. 749 ed. and trans. Horace L. Jones, Loeb Classical Library, V (London: W. Heinemann; New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1928); Appian xi. 57; Pausanias reported by John Malalas, Chronicle, ed. L. Dindorf (Bonn, 1831), p. 203 (all references to Malalas hereafter will be to this Dindorf edition except when a translation is referred to); Libanius Oration xi. 93;

of the city being called after Antiochus,[1] the son of Seleucus, and still others, rather poorly informed, speak of an Antiochus as the founder without knowing who he was exactly.[2]

The city founded by Seleucus continued growing under his successors until it became what Strabo called, a tetrapolis.[3] It attained such importance that different legends became connected

---

Justin Abrégé des histoires philippiques de Trogue Pompée, ed. and trans. E. Chambry and Mme. L. Thély-Chambry (2 vols.; Paris: Classique Garnier, 1936), xv. 4. 8.

[1]Malalas, p. 200 says that Seleucus named Antioch after his son Antiochus Soter; reporting Pausanias, who said that Seleucus founded it in his father's name, Malalas says (p. 204): "but no one gives a city the name of one dead, for it is an insult." The Arab geographer Yaqūt in Geographisches Wörterbuch (Muʿjam al-Buldān), ed. F. Wüstenfeld (6 vols.; Leipzig, 1866-1873), I, 382 has several reports on the builder of Antioch. The first one speaks of Antichus, the third king after Alexander as the builder; the second speaks of Antigonus who did not complete it, and so Seleucus completed its building; the third by the same reporter of the second tradition says: "King Antigonus built a city on the river Orontes and called it Antiocheia and it is the one which Seleucus completed . . . and called it after his son Antiochus and it is Antakiya." The evident confusion results from the vague knowledge of a city built by Antigonus before the building of Seleucus, so Antiocheia was reported as built by both kings.

[2]Jewish tradition referred to in S. Krauss, "Antioche," Revue des études juives, XLV (1902), 27, and nn. 5-6 states that Antioch had its name after Antiochus (אנטוכיה על שם אנטיוכס), but there is no definite mention of what Antiochus. The anonymous Arab chronicler in "Una descrizione araba di Antiochia," text and translation of Codex Vaticanus Arabicus 286 by I. Guidi, in Rendiconti della reale accademia dei lincei, classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche serie V, Vol. VI (Roma, 1897), 137 (referred to hereafter as Descrizione araba), says: "Antiochus, king of Rome was the founder of Antioch." Masʿūdi, Les prairies d'Or (Murūj al-Dhahab), ed. and trans. C. Barbier de Meynard and Pavet de Courteille (9 vols.; Paris, 1863-1917), III, 409 speaks of Antiochus as the founder of the city with no specification. He gives a curious interpretation of the name of Antichus (as it is written by some Arab historians) saying: "It means the one who builds the wall around" (انطاكية هو انطيخس وتفسيره محوط الذي بنا مدينة الحائط), a rather interesting case of popular derivation.

[3]Strabo xvi. 750. The different additions to the original foundation will be discussed in the next chapter.

with the different phases of its building and expansion, and the gods were made to appear in them as deciding factors.[1] Talismans were said to have been made to defend it against the powers of evil.[2] Among those most extraordinary powers were earthquakes, which culminated in that of 526 A.D. destroying most of the city.[3] But Antioch always rose again, sometimes better than before,[4] and Libanius in his famous Antiochicus says: "Antioch could have been four times bigger if there had been no misfortunes; it was smitten as city of man, but as beloved of God it arose the same."[5]

---

[1]On the legends of the building of Antioch and the little settlements in its vicinity, see Libanius Or. xi. 47 ff.; Malalas, pp. 198 ff.; Descrizione araba, p. 140; Masudi, op. cit., II, 282; E. S. Bouchier, A Short History of Antioch (Oxford, 1921), pp. 58 ff. These legends are not to be viewed simply as being invented to prove the importance of the city, as Bouchier believes, but their invention, in itself, is a proof of the importance of the city. Some aspects of these legends will be studied later in connection with the population.

[2]Some of these talismans were the Charoneion dedicated during the reign of Epiphanes by Leius the diviner; the talisman of the diviner Ablaccon under Tiberius against the floods; that of Debborius against earthquakes under Caligula with the inscription: "unshaking, unfalling"; the talismans of Apollonius of Tyana against scorpions, northerly winds, and mosquitoes. See Malalas, pp. 205, ff.; Descrizione araba, pp. 137 ff.; Bouchier, op. cit., pp. 68 ff.

[3]Among the best known earthquakes of Antioch were those of 148 B.C. under Alexander Balas, the ones under Caligula and Claudius, that of 115 A.D. under Trajan, 341 under Constantius II, 458 under Leo the Great, 526 under Justin, and 528 under Justinian. See Malalas, pp. 207, 243, 246, 279, 369, 419. Cassius Dio Roman History, ed. and trans. Ernest Cary, Loeb Classical Library (9 vols.; London: W. Heinemann; New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1914-1927), lxviii. 24 for the one under Trajan. H. Leclercq, "Antioche," Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie, ed. Dom Cabrol, Vol. I (1907). Other misfortunes of Antioch were: a fire under Antoninus Pius, partial burning of the city during the Persian invasion of Sapor I in 260 A.D., and the destruction of the city by Chosroes in 540 A.D.

[4]Malalas, p. 207; C. O. Müller, op. cit., p. 66.

[5]Libanius Or. xi. 228-229.

With Antioch is associated its beautiful western suburb, Daphne, only five miles (forty stadia) distant, with its precinct and temple of Apollo which had the right of asylum, its grove of laurels protected by special laws, and the legends which soon appeared as in the case of Antioch.[1] The City of Antioch itself was more often referred to as "near Daphne" (Ἀντιόχεια ἡ ἐπὶ Δάφνῃ) than "Antioch-on-the-Orontes," in order to distinguish it from the other Antiocheias.[2] Many other suburbs grew around

---

[1]Strabo xvi. 750; Libanius Or. xi. 94 on the legend of Apollo and Daphne; xi. 234 παγκάλην Δάφνην ; xi. 235-243 description of Daphne; Ammianus Marcellinus, ed. and trans. John C. Rolfe, Loeb Classical Library (3 vols.; Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press; London: W. Heinemann, 1935-1939) xxii. 12. 8 on the Castalian Fountain at Daphne.

[2]Strabo xvi. 750 and Flavius Josephus Antiquities xvii. 2. 24 in Complete Works, ed. S. Naber, Vol. V (Leipzig, 1893), speak of ἐπὶ Δάφνῃ which is the most current epithet; Stephanus of Byzantium, op. cit., pp. 62, 446 speaks of Antiocheia περὶ Δάφνην , and in p. 343 speaks of Antiocheia ἡ παρὰ Δάφνην ; Pliny Natural History, ed. and trans. H. Rackham, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press; London: W. Heinemann, 1938-) v. 18. 79 says: Antiochia Epidaphne cognominata. Tacitus, in The Annals, ed. and trans. John Jackson, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press; London: W. Heinemann, 1925-1937) ii. 83, mentioning a suburb by the name of Epidaphne distinct from Antioch and from Daphne, seems to blunder. Cf. Theodor Mommsen, The Provinces of the Roman Empire from Caesar to Diocletian, trans. W. P. Dickson, II (London, 1909), 128 n. 1. This probable mistake of Tacitus has affected the opinion of Bouchier, op. cit., pp. 1-2, who, relying on Tacitus believes it is unlikely that Antioch took its name from a suburb five miles distant from it. E. Babelon, Les Rois de Syrie (Paris, 1890), p. civ probably blunders in describing the quarter built by Epiphanes as nearer to Daphne, thus comparing that quarter to a suburb, and interpreting the money coined at Antioch under Epiphanes with the legend Ἀντιοχέων τῶν πρὸς Δάφνῃ as a special privilege of coining money given by Epiphanes to that suburb. Bouchier, op. cit., follows the same line of thought and concludes that the epithet applied to this suburb was later applied to the whole city. Our objection is that the evidence of Tacitus is unique and probably mistaken as Mommsen says; moreover the foundation of Epiphanes was nowhere regarded as a suburb, but as the fourth quarter of the city, and so the legend on the coin is simply the legend of the city of Antioch called here πρὸς Δάφνῃ as elsewhere it is called ἐπὶ or περὶ or παρὰ Δάφνην. Mommsen, Ibid., speaking of "Antioch upon Daphne" in the same way as we should speak of "Vienna upon the Prater," is slightly wrong, for the Prater was a part of Vienna in the first place, and moreover it could not be compared to Daphne in importance so as to identify a city by it.

Antioch, some of them close by its gates, others a few miles distant,[1] and the road to Daphne was a series of villas, resting places, and gardens.[2]

The legends which consider the choice of the site of Antioch as a divine choice, tend to show the real importance of that site.[3] Antioch was built in the plain extending between the River Orontes[4] to the north, and Mount Silpius to the south. This mountain is divided from a lower spur to the east, called Mount Staurin, by a mountain torrent called the Onopnictes (donkey drowner) or Parmenius. The torrent with its ravine was spanned later by what is known as the "Iron Gates." The two spurs rising

---

[1]Libanius Or. xi. 230 speaks of big and populous villages near Antioch (κῶμαι μεγάλαι καὶ πολυάνθρωποι) not less populous than many towns; he mentions (xi. 233) Heracleia to the west; Ammianus xxi. 15. 2 mentions Hippocephalus at three miles from the city; Stephanus of Byzantium, pp. 317, 446 mentions Thrakon-komé (Θρᾳκῶν κώμη), a village near Antioch, and also Meroe to the east of Antioch.

[2]Libanius Or. xi. 234; Greek Anthology, ed. and trans. W. R. Paton, Loeb Classical Library (5 vols.; London: W. Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1916-1918) ix. 680 contains an epigram by an anonymous author who mentions "a sea-side garden at Antioch in which there was a bath." This "sea-side garden" is not possible unless the epigram means the lake of Antioch to the north. Some writers have explained it as being either on the road to Daphne, or still west of Daphne towards the sea.

[3]For these legends, see supra, p. 4, n. 1; Descrizione araba, p. 139.

[4]The Orontes was named Axius Ἀξιός by the name of the chief river (now called Vardar) in Macedonia on which Pella was situated; also Drakon, Typhon, and Ophites in legend; see Malalas, pp. 197-198; Strabo xvi. 750. The Arabs later used the name Al-Urunt, Orontes (Yaqūt, I, 382), and al-Maklub meaning "the inverted" (Descrizione araba, p. 139). Bouchier, op. cit., p. 3 believes that the modern name Al-'Assi العاصي might be a corruption of Atzoio which means "rapid" in native Syrian; if he means in Syriac, the root would be ʿʿʿ meaning to resist, which is equivalent to the Arabic عصا, and thus Al-'Assi would mean the "resisting one" or "the rebel," because it flows from south to north contrary to the other rivers of Syria flowing from north to south or from east to west. For more detail, see E. Honigmann and Johanna Schmidt in "Orontes," RE, Vol. XVIII (1939).

abruptly to the south of the city are the last spurs of Mount Casius which begin near the coast south of the mouth of the Orontes.[1]

Ancient writers have admired the beauties and wealth of the site of Antioch. Libanius, the fervent admirer and the official rhetor of his native city thinks that "there is no city in the world in which big size has been united in equal measure with such beautiful situation."[2] Everything, according to him, combines in this city: the fertile soil, the running waters, and the

---

[1]Procopius Buildings, ed. and trans. H. B. Dewing, Loeb Classical Library (London: W. Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1914-1940), ii. 10. 16 speaks of Orocassius, instead of Silpius, and of the Staurin (see VII, 168, n. 1 of this translation for Staurin meaning "cross" and its explanation). C. O. Müller (see his conjectural map of Antioch in op. cit., Plate A) and Bouchier, op. cit., p. 4 speak of the Saturin instead of Staurin; Müller moreover confuses the Parmenius flowing through the city with the Phyrminus which flows outside the western walls and is a different stream. C. R. Morey, The Mosaics of Antioch (New York, 1938), p. 3 speaks of the mountains as lying east of Antioch which is incorrect. See D. G. Hogarth, "Antioch," Encyclopaedia Britannica, 11th ed., Vol. II (1910), where a good estimate of the site is given. The article of the 14th edition, however, speaks of Antioch lying in a plain separating the Lebanon ranges from the spurs of the Taurus which is too vague and partly incorrect. Antioch did not reach the foot of the mountain at the beginning, and the building of the city on the plain is proved by passages from Malalas, pp. 200, 233, and from Libanius Or. xi. 91 using the word καταβάντων for the earlier inhabitants of the settlement Iopolis moving to Antioch. The Tyche of Antioch represented seated on a high place does not mean that Antioch was on a hill. R. Förster, "Antiochia am Orontes," Jahrbuch des kaiserlich deutschen archäologischen Instituts, XII (1897), 112 explains it by the fact that the Tyche was not a personification of the landscape, but of the "Fortune" watching over Antioch, thus Eutychides made Silpius its seat.

[2]Libanius Or. xi. 196: οἶμαι γὰρ ουδεμίαν φανεῖσθαι τῶν οὐσῶν ἡ μέγεθός ἐστι τοσοῦτον ἐν οὕτω καλλίστῃ θέσει.

moderate climate.[1] Arab historians and geographers have given great testimony to the excellence and beauty of Antioch. Al-Wakidi relates that the Moslem conqueror of Antioch abstained from staying in it because of its excellent climate, fearing lest the love of the things of this world would conquer the hearts of the Moslems and keep them from obeying God.[2] Yaqūt speaks of Antioch as famous for its beauty, healthful and good climate, sweetness of its water, abundance of its fruits, and immensity of its resources.[3]

Several considerations contributed to the choice of the site of Antioch by Seleucus Nicator. Already Antigonus had recognized the importance of that north Syrian region around the

---

[1] Libanius was very proud of the water system of Antioch (see Libanius Or. xi. 19, 244-248). He wondered if the water of his city excited thirst or abated it. He speaks in the same Oration (xi. 19 ff.) of the ears of corn growing higher than trees, of the slopes of mountains planted until the summits, and of the Antiochenes alone rejoicing on every season.

[2] Al-Wakidi, Futūh al-Shām or the Conquest of Syria (Cairo, 1899), I, 178-179 says this was written in a letter from Abu-Ubayda to the caliph 'Umar in the year 17 A.H (637): وافي لم
اقم بك لطيب هوائك وافي خشيت على المسلمين ان يغلب حب
الدنيا على قلوبهم فيقطعهم عن طاعة ربهم.
It seems that 'Umar sent back a sort of reproach to his general telling him that God did not order the Believers to abstain from enjoying the good things of this world when they have accomplished good deeds.

[3] Yaqūt, I, 382 ff. He speaks also of the excellence of its baths whose waters arrive naturally without expense. Descrizione araba, p. 139 speaks in the same terms of the excellent and abundant waters. Al-Masūdi, II, 284 however relates that he saw for himself what the use of the water of Antioch produced in the bodies and entrails of men namely, the black and cold winds accompanied by intense diarrhea. He even related that Harun-ar-Rashid wanted to live in it, but when this description was given to him, and in addition that the swords rust and the perfumes don't keep their odor in Antioch, he abstained. Yaqūt, I, 386 relates the same tradition which he could have taken from Masūdi living in the tenth century A.D. long before he wrote. A modern traveller like E. Renan, The Apostles, ed. and trans. G. W. Carleton (New York, 1866), p. 199, considers the site of Antioch one of the most picturesque in the world.

westward bend of the Orontes when he began the foundation of Antigoneia in 306 B.C., somewhere to the northeast of the future site of Antioch. Diodorus gives an estimate of the importance of the situation of Antigoneia by saying that it was "well situated to watch Babylonia and the upper satrapies, and also Lower Syria and the provinces as far as Egypt."[1] The consideration here was a politico-military one. Antioch, moreover, was only fifteen miles (one hundred and twenty stadia) from the sea, so it had the advantage of being not far inland nor on the seashore, enjoying as Libanius says, the advantages of maritime and inland situation without suffering from their disadvantages.[2] The Orontes itself was navigable below Antioch, and its navigation was improved by a canal dug under the Romans.[3]

Thus, Antioch, protected by the Orontes to the north, and the mountains to the south, could face westward and communicate easily with the Greek world. At the same time, it could keep its connections with the rest of Syria by the valley of the Orontes to the south, and it could communicate with the north by the pass over the Amanus where stood the stronghold of Pagrae guarding the access to the Antiochean plain.[4] With the eastern territories it communicated through eastern Commagene and the crossings over the

---

[1] Diodorus Bibliotheca Historica xx. 47, ed. C. Fischer, Vol. V (Leipzig: Teubner, 1905); Hogarth, op. cit., considers Antigonus the first western sovereign to recognize the importance of this region which is the natural center of Syria so long as it is held by a western power.

[2] Strabo xvi. 751; Libanius Or. xi. 35-41.

[3] Pausanias Description of Greece, ed. and trans. W. H. S. Jones and H. A. Ormerod, Loeb Classical Library (London: W. Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1918-1935), viii. 29. 3 does not mention the emperor; the translator suggests Tiberius in IV, 48, n. 4.

[4] Strabo xvi. 751.

Euphrates. The north Syrian region became the true center of the Seleucid state after the fall of Antigonus at Ipsus in 301 B.C.; the colonizing activity of the Seleucids was greatest in Syria, but particularly in this region, considered the best portion of Syria by Strabo, where the four cities of the tetrapolis were founded.[1] Moreover, the Seleucid rulers preferred to stay in this region, hating to stay in Babylon or in the newly rising Seleuceia-on-the-Tigris where the Graeco-Macedonian element would be small, although the situation there would be more central for the rule of the eastern provinces.[2]

Political, Administrative, and Military Significance

Antioch is generally known as the capital of the Seleucids.[3] It has been maintained, however, that in the earlier reigns, the Seleucid kings and their court used to be frequently in Ephesus or Sardis or elsewhere in Asia Minor, and that not until Seleucus II Callinicus was driven from Asia Minor to Syria after the Battle of Ancyra, 240 B.C., or not until Asia Minor was lost after the Battle of Magnesia, 189 B.C., did Antioch become the definite capital of the kingdom.[4] This could be partly true,

---

[1] Strabo xvi. 749-750; the three other cities of this tetrapolis were Seleuceia-in-Pieria, Laodicea, and Apamea. A. H. M. Jones, The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces (Oxford, 1937), p. 243.

[2] Pierre Jouguet, Macedonian Imperialism and the Hellenization of the East, trans. M. R. Dobie (London, 1928), p. 354.

[3] E. Bikerman, Institutions des Séleucides (Paris, 1938), pp. 3 ff. for the fact that there was no special term used to designate officially the empire of the Seleucids except "the king so and so and his subjects."

[4] Edwyn R. Bevan, The House of Seleucus (London, 1902), I, 151; Hogarth, op. cit.; Bouchier, op. cit., p. 24; Morey, op. cit., p. 5.

and we know that political events obliged the kings at certain times to live in Asia Minor; but the real center of Seleucid rule long before 240 B.C. was in Antioch and northern Syria, as the annals of earlier reigns inform us and as the trend of the stories of foundation indicates, if we give them any credence.[1] In the period of weakness, civil strife, and disintegration after Antiochus IV Epiphanes, the Seleucid state was reduced to the tetrapolis as nucleus with Phoenicia, part of Coele-Syria and Cyrrhestica. The Seleucid kings are not only referred to as "kings of Syria," but even in certain cases as "kings of Antioch"; such was its paramount importance.[2]

Besides being the capital of Seleucid rule, Antioch was administratively the capital of a satrapy, according to the testimony of Strabo, who, on the authority of Poseidonius, says: "Appropriately to the tetrapolis, the Seleucis was also divided into four satrapies."[3]

---

[1]The tragedy of Laodice and Berenice, wives of Antiochus II Theos (261-246 B.C.), had Antioch and Daphne for theatre. Laodice had to leave Antioch for Asia Minor when Berenice came; Seleucus II, son of Laodice, had to be proclaimed king at Ephesus because Antioch was held by Berenice; Ptolemy III of Egypt came to Antioch to avenge his murdered sister Berenice. It was at Antioch that Stratonice, aunt of Seleucus II, caused a revolt to seize the throne. For these episodes, see Bouchier, op. cit., pp. 27-30.

[2]M. Rostovtzeff, The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World (Oxford, 1941), II, 843. Photius Bibliotheca, ed. I. Bekker (Berlin, 1824), II, 377, speaking of Alexander Balas, says: "king of Coele-Syria and Antioch"; Masūdi, op. cit., II, 284, when mentioning Ptolemy Philopator, says: "and he had wars with the kings of Shām (Syria) and the ruler of Antioch, Alexandrus." There is an evident confusion in names unless he meant Ptolemy Philometor, because Philopator ruled until 203 B.C., and there was no Seleucid Alexander until Balas in 150 B.C.; but the fact is that the king was associated in name with Antioch.

[3]Strabo xvi. 750. Most of the hellenistic scholars have subscribed to this statement. Jones, op. cit., p. 243, however, believes that the statement is a wrong inference by Strabo from Poseidonius; nevertheless, he agrees that Antioch was the capital of a satrapy. See his note 21 relating to p. 243 for his argument.

When Syria was organized into a Roman province by Pompey in 64 B.C., after a short period of Armenian rule under Tigranes and a three year revival of Seleucid rule, Antioch became the capital of that province and in it resided the Roman legate. Syria became an imperial province in 27 B.C. with Antioch as center, as a result of the reorganization of the provinces at the end of the Roman civil wars.[1] In 70 A.D. Judaea was separated from Syria, but Antioch was still the center of a large province, large enough to make the emperors contemplate its further subdivision whenever they wanted to punish Antioch and diminish its importance. Thus Spartianus says that Hadrian conceived such a hatred for the people of Antioch that he wished the separation of Syria from Phoenicia, that Antioch might not be called the civitatum metropolis of so many communities.[2] The actual division into Syria Coele and Syria Phoenice, however, took place under Septimius Severus around 194 A.D., after he subdued the province which had recognized Pescennius Niger as emperor; but Antioch was still the capital of Syria Coele.[3]

When Diocletian reorganized the Roman Empire into four great prefectures, he made himself ruler of the Orient which was the most important part. The Diocese of the Orient was

---

[1] E. Beurlier, "Le koinon de Syrie et les syriarques Artabanès et Hérode," Revue numismatique, XII (1894), 287. C. Karalevskij, "Antioche," Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques, ed. Monseigneur Baudrillart, Vol. III (1924).

[2] Spartianus Hadrian 14 in Scriptores Historiae Augustae (hereafter referred to as SHA) ed. and trans. David Magie, Loeb Classical Library (3 vols.; London: W. Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1921-1932).

[3] G. A. Harrer, Studies in the History of the Roman Province of Syria (Princeton, 1915), p. 87 says that the division took place between 194 and 198; Mommsen, op. cit., II, 117-118 says that the division took place not without resistance from Antioch; Beurlier, op. cit., p. 287.

administered by a comes (count) called comes Orientes. He supervised the governors of the provinces in the diocese and had judicial and administrative functions. The comes had his residence in Antioch and beside him was not only the governor of the province of Coele-Syria--the consularis Syriae--of which Antioch was capital, but also the magister militum, or the commander of troops for the eastern diocese. The lists of comites and consulares show that they changed quite often.[1] Thus Antioch was the residence of the three highest Roman civil and military authorities in Asia. The further subdivision of Coele-Syria by detaching from it Euphratensis in 341[2] did not diminish the importance of Antioch. Chinese accounts of Antioch speak of the king, meaning probably the count of the East, living in a palace a mile in circumference and say that Antu (Antioch) was the capital of Ta T'sin which vaguely denotes the Roman Empire; thus Antioch appeared in the fourth century as the metropolis of the world.[3]

While Antioch was the capital of the kingdom and the chef-lieu of a satrapy under the Seleucids, and while it was the center of a Syrian province later under the Romans, and the metropolis of the Roman East, it was at the same time an autonomous city governed by its own elected magistrates, council, and assembly of citizens, modelled theoretically on the government of a Greek city. Polybius

---

[1]Glanville Downey, A Study of the Comites Orientes and the Consulares Syriae (Princeton, 1939), pp. 7, 12-22; Karalevskij, op. cit.; Roger Rouck, Studies in Libanius and Antiochene Society in the Fourth Century (Ann Arbor, 1935), p. 97.

[2]Karalevskij, op. cit.

[3]Morey, op. cit., p. 45. Al-Balādhuri, Futūh al-Buldān (The Conquests of the Countries), ed. De Goeje (Leyden, 1866), p. 147 relates the high esteem in which the city was held by the caliphs 'Umar and 'Uthman; when it was conquered 'Umar wrote to his general: "Station in Antioch Moslems of strong determination and good management; let them be its garrison and never stop their allowances."

gives us a proof of an autonomous government of Antioch, when he speaks of the extraordinary Antiochus IV Epiphanes going round the market place like a candidate begging citizens to give him their vote, sometimes for the office of aedile (ἀγορανόμος), sometimes for that of tribune (δήμαρχος).[1] Malalas mentions the council hall (βουλευτήριον) built by Epiphanes outside the city of Antioch where all senators (συγκλητικούς),[2] citizens (πολιτευομένων), and householders (κτητόρων) gathered.[3] When Malalas speaks of Pompey building a council house for the Antiochenes, because it had fallen,[4] he probably means the one built by Epiphanes.

We have no means of determining the real extent of the autonomy of Antioch under the Seleucids; but if we measure it by that of Seleuceia-in-Pieria as illustrated by an ordinance (πρόσταγμα) of Seleucus IV and by the decree of the city in response to the ordinance in 186 B.C., we should say that the authority of the king and of the royal governor (ἐπιστάτης) was great.[5] However if we compare Antioch to Alexandria of the

---

[1]Polybius The Histories xxvi. 1 ed. and trans. W. R. Paton, Loeb Classical Library (6 vols; London: W. Heinemann; New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1922-1927); Athenaeus The Deipnosophists, ed. and trans. C. B. Gulick, Loeb Classical Library (7 vols.; London: W. Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1927-1941), v. 193d. Upon being elected he would sit upon the ivory curule chair listening to lawsuits and pronouncing judgment with display of interest. Bikerman, op. cit., p. 158 concludes from this text that Antioch had electoral campaigns and that the agoranomos had judicial power.

[2]The Chronicle of John Malalas, Books VIII-XVIII, trans. M. Spinka and G. Downey (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1940), p. 16 translates it "nobles" which is not fitting.

[3]Malalas, p. 205.

[4]Ibid., p. 211.

[5]Henri Seyrig, "Décret de Séleucie et ordonnance de Seleucus IV," Syria, XIII (1932), 256. The king enjoins the governor, magistrates (archontes) and the city to treat his friend

Ptolemies, we see that the latter was not administered as a normal Greek city, that self-government in it was curtailed so as to make it like other administrative centers except that it was the residence of kings, and that the principles of hellenization followed by the Seleucids were more favorable to the institutions of the city.[1] Moreover we see Antioch becoming more important as the Seleucid power grows weaker after the middle of the second century B.C.[2] The city territory of Antioch grew until it devoured the Seleucid satrapy at the end of the Seleucid rule.[3]

Pompey preserved the autonomy of Antioch and rebuilt the council chamber as we have seen.[4] Caesar later visited Antioch and confirmed its autonomy by an edict calling it "metropolis

---

in a way worthy of his devotion and to erect a statue for him in their city. The response or decree of the city was in the name of the governor and archontes, and motivated by the king's ordinance; they gave that particular friend citizen rights and decided to erect the statue. C. B. Welles, Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period (New Haven, 1934), p. 186, letter 45. Ulrich Kahrstedt, "Syrische Territorien in hellenistischer Zeit," Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, XIX, 2 (1926), 47 speaks of a governor in each of the four cities of the tetrapolis who controlled the self-government of the city and administered the territory of the satrapy outside the city-territory.

[1]Rostovtzeff, The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire (Oxford, 1926), p. 262; Jouguet, op. cit., p. 366 says: "One has the impression that the Seleucids' control of cities was less strict than that of the Ptolemies."

[2]Cities began to settle their quarrels among themselves without appealing to kings, as in the humorous account of Poseidonius about the war between Apamea and Larissa in 142 B.C. See Athenaeus iv. 176. Rostovtzeff, The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World, II, 843.

[3]Kahrstedt, op. cit., p. 103.

[4]G. Downey, "The Political Status of Roman Antioch," Berytus, VI (1939), 1 calls the report according to which Pompey was bribed by the citizens to retain the autonomy of Antioch, malicious; Bouchier, op. cit., p. 88 says that the Seleucids had proved their incapacity and so, in rejecting the claim of Antiochus Asiaticus and giving liberty to Antioch, Pompey had no need to be bribed.

sacred, and inviolable, and autonomous, and sovereign, and the capital of the East" (Ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ τῇ μητροπόλει ἱερᾷ καὶ ἀσύλῳ καὶ αὐτονόμῳ καὶ ἀρχούσῃ καὶ προκαθημένῃ τῆς ἀνατολῆς).[1] We have moreover a mention of the council and assembly of Antioch (εἰς Ἀντιοχέων τὴν βουλὴν καὶ τὸν δῆμον) in a letter of Octavian to the City of Rhosus of around 40 B.C.[2]

The privileged status of Antioch will appear more clearly if we compare it again to the big metropolis of Alexandria which, despite renewed efforts, did not succeed in obtaining a council (βουλή) from the emperors. When Emperor Claudius answered the Alexandrians' request for such a council, he told them that he did not know whether such a council had existed under the Ptolemies, and he asked the prefect to report on the question, which, as Théodore Reinach puts it, was a polite way of postponing the reform.[3]

Under Trajan we find mentioned an assembly of municipalities of the Syrian province meeting at Antioch for the discussion of games and other interests. Its name is mentioned on the bronze

---

[1]Malalas, p. 216; Antioch adopted the Pompeian, then the Caesarean era beginning 48 B.C., and its autonomy was reflected in the issuing of bronze coins and silver tetradrachms; the titles of "sacred, inviolable, and autonomous" appeared on its coins: see Downey, "The Political Status of Roman Antioch," op. cit., p. 1; Pliny Natural History v. 18. 19 speaks of Antioch as Antiochia Libera.

[2]Pierre Roussel, "Un syrien au service de Rome et d'Octave," Syria, XV (1934), 34, lines 3-7. Rhosus is the modern Arsuz between Seleuceia and Cilicia.

[3]Théodore Reinach, "L'empereur Claude et les Juifs," Revue des études juives, LXXIX (1924), 118; Rostovtzeff, The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire, pp. 271-273 says the 'cities' of Egypt were cities from the social and economic point of view, but they were not 'cities' as regards constitution and remained legally metropoleis or administrative chefs-lieux.

coins of Antioch as follows: ΚΟΙΝΟΝ CVPIAC and it was presided over by a Syriarch.[1] The liberties of Antioch could have diminished with time, as some maintain, but the organs of city autonomy continued to function.[2] The hardest blow suffered by Antioch was its punishment by Septimius Severus for its support of Niger, by making it subject to Laodiceia.[3] His son, Caracalla, however interceded and the ancient rights of Antioch were restored.[4] Not only that, but Caracalla who sojourned in Antioch in 215 A.D., gave it the status of colony although it still had to pay tribute.[5]

Besides its importance as a capital and as an autonomous city, Antioch was a great military center. When Ausonius wrote in the fourth century A.D. on the order of famous cities, he placed among the titles of Antioch to fame that "her rival power confronts the faithless Persians."[6] In fact, the political and military importance of Antioch increased with the increase of the

---

[1]Beurlier, op. cit., p. 288.

[2]V. Schultze, Antiochia, Vol. III of Altchristliche Städte und Landschaften (Gütersloh, 1930), p. 135.

[3]Herodian History of the Roman Empire Since Marcus Aurelius, ed. K. Stavenhagen (Leipzig: Teubner, 1922), iii. 6. 9; Suidas Lexicon, ed. G. Bernhardy (Halle, 1853), II, 699.

[4]Spartianus Caracalla 1 in SHA.

[5]Downey, "The Political Status of Roman Antioch," op. cit., p. 2 believes that this act of Carcalla was the last step in the rehabilitation of Antioch, and removed the political stigma imposed by Severus; the title gave no new privileges but was for prestige. For the question of the payment of tribute, the phrase Salvis tributis in the act is interpreted by most scholars quoted by Downey as meaning "the tribute remaining unimpaired": see his note 9, p. 2.

[6]Ausonius xi. 1-5 ed. and trans. Hugh G. Evelyn White, Loeb Classical Library (London: W. Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1919).

Parthian, then the Persian danger. It was here that the armed forces were organized and the councils on campaigns were held, often in the presence of emperors.[1] The governorship of Syria was for this reason, the most esteemed of all. Three legions were stationed in it, two in Coele-Syria after the division of the province, and one in Phoenicia. The military force had its own Campus Martius near Antioch.[2] Seleuceia-in-Pieria, the port of Antioch, moreover, was the chief naval base in the Roman East,[3] and this added still more to the military importance of Antioch.

With this military aspect of the significance of Antioch is associated the residence of emperors with their court during their eastern campaigns. The stay of emperors in the city was attended not only by an increase in its population, but by an intense social life and by a promotion of building activity. Strabo relates the account of Nicholas of Damascus who says that at Antioch he chanced to meet the Indian ambassadors despatched to Caesar Augustus.[4] Trajan's stay in Antioch in 115 A.D., was attended by the presence of so many different kinds of people, that when Cassius Dio speaks of the earthquake which occurred during his stay, he says: "The whole world under Roman sway suffered disaster." (Καὶ οὕτως ἐν τῇ Ἀντιοχείᾳ πάσα ἡ οἰκουμένη ἡ ὑπὸ τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις οὖσα ἐσφάλη).[5]

---

[1]Schultze, op. cit., p. 344; P. Chrysostomus Baur, Der Heilige Johannes Chrysostomus und seine Zeit (München, 1929), I, 30.

[2]Mommsen, op. cit., II, 117-118; Bouchier, op. cit., p. 94.

[3]Antioch-on-the-Orontes, ed. W. Elderkin and R. Stillwell (3 vols.; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1934-1941), III, 107, Nos. 231 ff., for epitaphs of sailors in Seleuceia.

[4]Strabo xv. 719.

[5]Cassius Dio lxviii. 24; the editor mentions a variant ἐσφάγη instead of ἐσφάλη VIII, 405, n. 1.

Caracalla, indulged in luxurious living at Antioch in 215 A.D.[1] His brother Gaeta had even thought of moving the seat of government to Antioch when they were discussing the division of the empire between them.[2]

Several episodes in the life of the Seleucid kings and Roman emperors are connected with Antioch. As for the Seleucids, it is no wonder, for it was their residence. The most outstanding episodes of their reign which interest us were the dynastic troubles in which the Antiochenes had sometimes to take part and thus earn that proverbial reputation for fickleness and riotousness which passed to posterity and with which we shall deal later. Under the Romans, Antioch witnessed the proclamation of several emperors; its people in most cases were simple spectators of what the army was doing, but the confusion of their attitude with that of the army ended with prejudice to their reputation.

The Syrian legate Mucianus was the principal agent in encouraging Vespasian to assume the rule of the empire against Vitellius, and he administered to his own troops the oath of allegiance to Vespasian in Antioch.[3] Avidius Cassius proclaimed himself emperor in 175 A.D. against Marcus Antoninus (Aurelius); he was the governor of the eastern provinces and the citizens of Antioch sided with him.[4] As for Niger, he was hailed emperor by

---

[1]Cassius Dio lxxviii. 20.

[2]Herodian iv. 3. 7. The list of emperors who sojourned in Antioch is long. We may cite Marcus Aurelius, Septimius Severus, Aurelian, Julian, Jovian, and Valens. We shall have to refer to several emperors in this connection in studying the character of the Antiochenes, especially the notorious stay of Julian.

[3]Tacitus The Histories ii. 80 ed. and trans. Clifford Moore, Loeb Classical Library (London: W. Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1925-1937).

[4]Vulcacius Gallicanus Avidius Cassius 7, 9 in SHA; Cassius Dio lxxii. 17-29.

the legions in Syria in 194 A.D. He rejoiced in festivals without restraint with the Antiochenes, but when Severus defeated him, the citizens of Antioch were deprived of several privileges chiefly the loss of their autonomy because they helped Niger with supplies.[1] In 217 A.D., Macrinus caused the murder of Caracalla and seized imperial power; he reigned for a year, living in luxury in Antioch, but Julia Maesa intrigued for her grandson Elagabalus, won the army, and Macrinus was defeated. Elagabalus gave the soldiers money not to sack Antioch.[2]

Economic Importance and Wealth of Antioch

Several authors were impressed by the wealth of the kings who ruled in Antioch, by the wealth of the Syrian cities in general and of Antioch in particular. Polybius mentions the masses of gold and silver exhibited in the great celebration of Antiochus IV Epiphanes at Daphne in 167 B.C.[3] Epiphanes was wealthy enough not only to make such a big display but also to make gifts to Greek cities and maintain a big army. As a testimony to the great wealth of the Seleucids, we have a significant passage in the Life of Agis, king of Sparta, by Plutarch, where Agis says: "The servants and slaves of the satraps and overseers of Ptolemy and Seleucus have larger possessions than all the kings of Sparta put together."[4] The fact is that although the Seleucids

---

[1]Spartianus Severus, 6, 9 in SHA; John of Antioch in Excerpta Historica of Constantine Porphyrogenetes, ed. Boissevain et al. (Berlin, 1903-1910), III, 90.

[2]Cassius Dio lxxviii. 31; lxxx; Capitolinus Macrinus in SHA.

[3]Polybius xxx. 25; Athenaeus v. 194; x. 439.

[4]Plutarch's Lives Agis 7, ed. and trans. Bernadotte Perrin, Loeb Classical Library (London: W. Heinemann; New York: Macmillan Company, 1914-1926).

lost Asia Minor under Antiochus III, their authority was reestablished in the East for a time, and they annexed the rest of Syria-Palestine which had belonged to the Ptolemies; so prosperity continued, and the last Seleucid kings were not needy.[1] The army of Antiochus VII Sidetes (138-129 B.C.) marching against the Parthians with its enormous train (ἀποσκευή) and comforts, and the golden cups belonging to the children of Antiochus X would tend to prove continued prosperity.[2]

Poseidonius speaks of the luxury of Syrian cities, and of Syria in the first century B.C. as exceedingly rich and fertile.[3] Syrian industries were flourishing and included toreutic art, glass-making, scented oils and perfumes. Polybius shows us Epiphanes wandering at the silversmiths' and goldsmiths' workshops in Antioch discussing technical matters with the molders and other craftsmen.[4] This, added to the objects exhibited in the celebration at Daphne--gold and silver vessels, silver plate, litters, urns and unguents--would constitute an evidence for advanced industrial and artistic skill in Antioch.

The chief sources of wealth in Antioch, however, were not industry, but agriculture and commerce. The fertile city-territory of Antioch was divided among big landowners, among whom were the prominent city councillors (βουλευταί)[5] who had to take care

---

[1]Rostovtzeff, The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World, II, 695.

[2]Athenaeus xii. 540 b; Justin xxxviii. 10. 1-4; Bikerman, op. cit., pp. 91, 35, n. 14.

[3]Athenaeus v. 210 f; xii. 527 f.

[4]Polybius xxvi. 1; Athenaeus v. 193d; Charles Diehl, "L'école artistique d'Antioche et les trésors d'argenterie syrienne," Syria, II (1921), 81-82 says: "The vogue of the works of its workshops spread all over the Orient and Occident and influenced the formation of iconography."

[5]Julian Misopogon 362C in The Works of the Emperor Julian,

of the games and other entertainments, of heating the baths, cashing the taxes, and answering for order in the city.[1] One of them must have been Sosibius, under Augustus who left a fund for the celebration of games.[2]

Commerce and transportation were the chief sources of wealth in Antioch. Already before Seleucid times, this north Syrian area was a great highway of trade between the Aegean world, internal Syria, and Mesopotamia.[3] Under the Seleucids, the road system was developed in such a way as to prevent caravans from going to Tyre or Sidon, which were under Ptolemaic rule. So most of the roads converged on Antioch and the new Seleucid harbors, especially Seleuceia, which rivalled those of Asia Minor.[4] Thus the new current of trade until the end of the middle ages passed by the great Khorassan and Persian route attaining Halab-Beroea (Aleppo) and Kinnesrin-Chalcis, then going to Antioch where one route branched to Alexandretta and Cilicia, the other to Seleuceia-in-Pieria.[5] The great royal road connecting Antioch and

---

ed. and trans. W. C. Wright, Loeb Classical Library (3 vols.; London: W. Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1913), speaks of ten thousand lots of land privately owned (μυρίους κλήρους γῆς ἰδίας κεκτημένη).

[1]Schultze, op. cit., p. 135.

[2]Malalas, p. 224 calls him a συγκλητικός.

[3]Leonard Woolley, "Excavations near Antioch in 1936," Antiquaries Journal, XVII (1937), 2: good anchorage at the mouth of the Orontes, navigable river, road opening to Antioch plain, pass to Halab (Aleppo) along the hillside, caravan route to Nineveh past Carchemish, or to Babylon along the Euphrates.

[4]Phoenicia and the rest of Syria were annexed by the Seleucids only in the early second century B.C. Seleuceia-in-Pieria was in Ptolemaic hands 246-219 B.C. See Rostovtzeff, The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World, I, 173, 461; II, 697.

[5]René Dussaud, Topographie historique de la Syrie antique et mediévale (Paris, 1927), p. 433.

Seleuceia-on-the-Tigris was of great importance, and the occupation of Babylonia by the Parthians did not interrupt the eastern trade, as evidenced by the several Seleucid coin heads found in Parthia.[1] The Seleucids moreover traded with Rhodes after it was free from Egypt, and Syrians played a great role in the commerce of Delos.[2]

In spite of civil wars and oppression under early Roman rule, there were new opportunities for economic expansion, and Syria maintained its fertility and transit position and enterprising spirit. The Italian negotiatores who used to come for trade became more numerous after annexation by Rome, and particularly after the first century A.D., but they were unable to compete with the shrewd Orientals.[3] Antioch became "a city known to all the world," as Ammianus says,[4] and without rival, so rich it was in imported and domestic commodities. The commercial opportunities of Antioch were among the motives for the coming of the Jews, and

---

[1]Jouguet, op. cit., p. 354; Rostovtzeff, The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World, II, 864; several representations of camels crouching, saddled, or harnessed were found on lamps, terracottas, and small bronzes in the Hellenistic-Roman period illustrating that caravan trade: see Rostovtzeff, ibid., I, Plate LVI, p. 460.

[2]Rostovtzeff, ibid., I, 463; II, 702: Graeco-Syrians were found in the lists of Ephebes of the second century B.C., and sanctuaries of Syrian gods were found at Delos. Libanius Or. xi. 100 gives us an idea of this role of Antioch as transit center saying: "Seleucus built our city as starting point for the founding of others, so that the cities will stand in the place of traffic stations for travellers."

[3]Caesar The Civil Wars iii. 102 ed. and trans. A.J. Paskett, Loeb Classical Library (London: W. Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1914); Rostovtzeff, The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World, II, 981; The Social and Ecomomic History of the Roman World, p. 158.

[4]Ammianus xiv. 8. 8: Mundo cognita civitas.

rabbinic tradition has conserved the mention of the perfume of Antioch as an important article of commerce.[1] The homilies of John Chrysostom give evidence of fabulous wealth in the fourth century,[2] considered one of the periods of greatest prosperity in Antioch, as is illustrated also by a passage from the expositio totius mundi (description of the whole world) speaking of the same period and saying regarding Antioch: "where all good things exist in abundance" (abundans omnibus bonis).[3]

Titles and Rank of Antioch

We have important testimony to the importance of Antioch in the titles given to it by a wide range of writers in ancient times. We have been careful to notice that the writers do not all belong to one age or to one country or one religion. Some of them, it is true, are prominent citizens of Antioch as Libanius, Ammianus, and Chrysostom in the fourth century A.D., and Malalas in the sixth, and it would be natural that they give great titles to their native city. But others had no relation with Antioch, except for a short visit in a few cases. All these writers--geographers, historians, chroniclers, sophists, religious men, and satirists--lived between the first and sixth centuries, except for

---

[1] C. Kraeling, "The Jewish Community at Antioch," Journal of Biblical Literature, LI (1932), 133. Der Babylonische Talmud, ed. L. Goldschmidt (Leipzig, 1922), IV, 677, n. 37: "Rabbi Jannai said, 'the perfumes of Antioch are like money.'"
(אמר רבי ינאי בשמים של אנטכיא הרי הן ככספים)

[2] John Chrysostom Homilies on St. Matthew lxiii. 4; lxvi. 3 in Chrysostom's Complete Works, Vols. XLVII-LXIV of the Patrologiae Graecae, ed. J. P. Migne (Paris, 1859). Translated in part in Vols. IX-XIII of The Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, 1st series, ed. P. Schaff (New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1888-1889).

[3] Schultze, op. cit., p. 109, n. 2; Bouchier, op. cit., p. 151.

the Arab historians who lived later in the middle ages. The titles are connected either with the beauty of the city or with its political importance, or still with its religious position and general greatness. Pagan writers never refrained from giving it great titles even when, in the fourth century, Christianity was claiming it as one of its chief centers.[1]

Strabo, at the beginning of our era, says: "Antiocheia is the metropolis of Syria and here was established the royal residence for the rulers of the country."[2] Zosimus later in the fifth century, speaks of it as "the metropolis of the whole East,"[3] and Stephanus of Byzantium, a century later, calls it likewise, "the metropolis of the East."[4] Lucian of Samosata in the second century speaks of Antioch as "the most graceful city,"[5] and Athenaeus towards the end of that century speaks of it as "the beautiful."[6] Philostratus in the same century gives it for the first time the epithet with which it was to be commonly identified for several centuries, "Antioch the Great."[7] Malalas adopted this

---

[1]Notice especially the titles given by Ammianus, Libanius, and Zosimus.

[2]Strabo xvi. 750. In Strabo's day, Antioch was the capital of the Roman province of Syria, after it had been the center of Seleucid rule.

[3]Zosimus i. 27 ed I. Bekker (Bonn, 1837).

[4]Stephanus of Byzantium, op. cit., p. 222: τῇ ἴῳ Ἀντιοχείας μητροπόλεως.

[5]Lucian On the Pantomime 76 in Lucian's Works, ed. C. Jacobitz (3 vols.; Leipzig: Teubner, 1887-1893), II, 166: οἱ γὰρ Ἀντιοχεῖς εὐψυχότατοι πόλις.

[6]Athenaeus i. 20b: Ἀντιοχίων δὲ τὴν Καλήν. Of Alexandria, he says, "the golden," and of Rome, "the populace of the world" or "epitome of the civilized world"; Hogarth, op. cit., speaks of "the golden" as an epithet of Antioch; but we have not come across such an epithet for the city anywhere in the authors we have consulted.

[7]Flavius Philostratus Life of Apollonius of Tyana, ed. and

title and attached it to the name of the city almost throughout his chronicle until the year 528 when Antioch came to be called Theoupolis.[1] Stephanus of Byzantium[2] also uses Theoupolis for the Antioch of Justinian's time, and similarly Procopius.[3] Al-Masudi refers to most of these titles saying: "Christianity calls Antioch 'the city of God,' and they call it also 'the king's city' and 'the mother of cities' because Christianity began in it."[4] The anonymous Arab historian says: "When this city was built it was called 'the Great,'"[5] and so he had undoubtedly an echo of the title which remained attached to it for several centuries.

Ammianus calls his native city, Antioch "the fair crown of the Orient,"[6] and Libanius the official rhetor of the city speaks

---

trans. F. C. Conybeare, Loeb Classical Library (London: W. Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1912) i. 16; relating the visit of Apollonius to Antioch, he says: ἐπεφοίτησε καὶ Ἀντιοχείᾳ τῇ μεγάλῃ.

[1]It possibly seemed to Malalas as necessary to mention the title "great" with the name of Antioch, as it seems necessary to the modern Oriental to speak of Jerusalem as القدس الشريف, or of Makkah as حَمَّة المكرّمة. For the use of Theoupolis, see Malalas, p. 443.

[2]Stephanus of Byzantium, op. cit., p. 309.

[3]Procopius The Buildings ii. 10. 2.

[4]Masūdi, op. cit., III, 406.

[5]Descrizione araba, p. 139: وللا بُنيت هذه المدينة سُميت العظمى We disagree with William F. Stinespring in his "Description of Antioch in Codex Vaticanus Arabicus 286" (unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Graduate School, Yale University, 1932), Commentary, p. 1, where he says that the title العظمى in the anonymous historian is not a translation of μεγάλη because the Arabic term has a superlative meaning and Greek writers do not use the superlative, so he infers that the Arab historian considered Antioch the greatest city in the world. We would like to suggest that the term عظمى need not be used in a superlative sense, and when the adjective "great" for the feminine is translated into Arabic, it is rendered by العظمى more frequently than by العظيمة when speaking of countries and cities as Great Britain بريطانيا العظمى. The date of the anonymous historian was set around the eleventh century by Stinespring (see his Introduction, pp. 19 ff.).

[6]Ammianus xxii. 9. 14: Orientes apicem pulcrum.

of it as "the beautiful and the great."[1] Chrysostom in giving epithets to the city does not think only in terms of its political, but also of its religious importance. He calls it "the head and mother of all that lie towards the East."[2] Al-Wakidi refers to the religious importance of Antioch when he calls it "the seat of Christianity."[3]

In Syriac writers we find especially the two titles, "the great" ( ),[4] and Theoupolis, the city of our God ( ),[5] which were probably translated from the Greek, inasmuch as the Syriac text itself is often the translation of a Greek original as in these two cases. We are not sure if the "royal city" ( ) mentioned in the Homily of Isaac of Antioch in the fifth century is about Antioch or Constantinople,[6] for, although Antioch was no more a royal capital,

---

[1]Libanius Or. xxxi. 7: Ἀντιόχειᾳ τῇ καλῇ καὶ μεγάλῃ.

[2]Chrysostom Homilies on the Statues (called also Homilies to the People of Antioch) iii. 1; in ibid. ii. 7 he calls it "the head of those which lie under the eastern sky."

[3]Al-Wakidi, op. cit., I, 178-179, quoting the words of the Moslem general announcing the conquest of Antioch to the caliph Umar, and calling it كرسي النصرانية .

[4]Zacharie le Scholastique et al. Vie de Sévère d'Antioche, trans. M. A. Kugener in Patrologia Orientalis (referred to hereafter as P.OR), ed. R. Graffin and F. Nau, II (Paris, 1907), 54, 87. The life of Severus, partiarch of Antioch, by Zachariah the Scholastic was written in the early part of the sixth century in Greek but the Syriac version from which this title is quoted, was preserved.

[5]Ibid., p. 327. The title is here quoted from another biography of Severus by John, higoumenos of the monastery of Beth-Aphthonia; in this case also only the Syriac version remained.

[6]C. Moss, "Homily on the Royal City," Zeitschrift für Semitistik, VII (1929), 295 where the author believes it was probably on Constantinople after the repulse of the Huns in 441. See Homilies of Isaac of Antioch, ed. Paul Bédjan (Paris, 1905), pp. iv ff. for the confusion of three Isaacs of Antioch under the name of the great Isaac, writer of the homilies.

yet it was sometimes referred to as a royal city. The Talmudic tradition considers Antioch one of four cities in the Roman Empire which are really royal.[1]

As for the rank of Antioch in comparison with the other great cities of the world in this period, we have testimonies ranging from the first to the fifth century. The basis for this comparison differs, but in general it is the size and wealth, or the size and power of the city, for the ancients do not seem to have based the importance of a city on the number of inhabitants as we shall see. Strabo ranks Antioch as the third city in the Orient: "It does not fall much short, either in power or in size, of Seleuceia-on-the-Tigris or Alexandria in Egypt."[2] Josephus writing about half a century later considers Antioch "in extent and opulence" (μεγέθους τε ἕνεκα καὶ τῆς ἄλλης εὐδαιμονίας) unquestionably the third among the cities of the Roman world.[3] Müller completes this statement by considering the first two Rome and Alexandria.[4]

In the fourth century neither Alexandria nor Seleuceia-on-the-Tigris were superior to Antioch. Libanius ranks Antioch third in the world, the first two cities being Rome and the rising Constantinople; even the latter was ranked second, not for

---

[1] Monumenta Talmudica, ed. S. Krauss, V (Vienna, 1913), 6, No. 10. The other three cities are Asia--which is Ephesus according to Krauss, "Antioche," op. cit., p. 38, and Sardis according to H. Leclercq, op. cit.--Alexandria, and Carthage.

[2] Strabo xvi. 750.

[3] Jewish Wars iii. 2. 29 in Works of Josephus, ed. and trans. H. St. J. Thackeray and Ralph Marcus, Loeb Classical Library (7 vols.; London: W. Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1926-). Josephus was writing about the year 67 A.D., when the forces of Vespasian assembled in Antioch before going to fight in Palestine.

[4] C. O. Müller, op. cit., p. 2.

population and size, but for its political importance as a new capital.[1] This new estimate agrees with the chart of roads in the Roman Empire made by a cartographer in the same century, representing symbolically the relative importance of cities and giving honor to the three above-mentioned cities making them appear on the map as walled cities.[2]

Ausonius in that same century has different considerations for his comparison. In his poetical "Order of Famous Cities" (ordo urbium nobilium), the first among cities is golden Rome, home of the gods. The second rank he gives to two cities, Constantinople for her new-born prosperity, and Carthage for her ancient wealth. "The third would be Antioch the home of Phoebus' laurel, if Alexander's settlement were willing to be placed fourth: both hold the same rank."[3] Thus Ausonius hesitates between the two, Antioch and Alexandria. It is evident, however, that Carthage and Alexandria are given those ranks for historical reasons; both had been, but were no longer superior to Antioch.

The first place in the Eastern Roman Empire in the sixth century was accorded to Antioch by Procopius not only in wealth and size, but also in population.[4]

Before attaining the third place among the cities of the world, and while Antioch was still a small foundation, the early Seleucids wanted it to be considered the center of the world. It is known that the place where the two main streets of Antioch met

---

[1] Libanius Or. xxxiii. 24; Pack, op. cit., p. 12.

[2] Morey, op. cit., p. 13. The map is preserved in a copy of the twelfth or thirteenth century in Vienna.

[3] Ausonius xi. 1-5.

[4] Procopius History of the Wars, ed. and trans. H. B. Dewing, Loeb Classical Library (London: W. Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1914-1940) i. 17. 36.

was called the Omphalos (navel) or the center of the city.[1] The Omphalos stone with Apollo sitting on it is represented on the coins of Antioch;[2] but it was an imitation of Delphi where the Omphalos on which Apollo sat was supposed to be the center of the world. It is believed by Babelon that Antiochus I, unable to conquer the European part of the Macedonian Empire where was the Temple of Delphian Apollo, ancestor of his race, established a new Omphalos at Antioch which thus pretended to be the world's center.[3]

Other Aspects of the Importance of Antioch

The philosopher emperor Julian considered the glory of Antioch to depend on two things: the famous shrine of Apollo, and the school of rhetoric.[4] For him, and for those who were used to associate Hellenism with paganism and the gods, Antioch was of foremost importance. Libanius gives us a picture of it as a center of Hellenism and Greek studies, with students coming from Phoenicia, Palestine, Egypt, Cyprus, Arabia, Cilicia, and Cappadocia, for Apollo found Antioch more favorable to the Muses than

---

[1] Malalas, p. 233; Libanius Or. xi. 204; Müller, op. cit., p. 57; Descrizione araba, p. 147 renders it by the term المصلبة and then explains it by saying: "It means the center of the city." Stinespring, op. cit., Translation, p. 16, Commentary, p. 43 probably did not understand the Arabic term meaning "cross-roads" or "meeting of two streets" and so he amended or rather corrupted it making it المُصَلَّبَه to fit the word Omphalos, thus giving us a singular instance of the corruption of a correct text by a modern scholar to try to impose on it his own interpretation, and at the same time producing a singular way of writing an Arabic word!

[2] Babelon, op. cit., Plate V, No. 4 with explanation in p. 22, No. 157. Müller, op. cit., p. 58 speaks of the coin of Antiochus I with Apollo sitting on the Omphalos.

[3] Babelon, op. cit., pp. xliv-xlviii.

[4] Julian Works, II, 418.

the inhabitants of other parts.[1] According to him the beauties of the Hellenes were divided between two cities, Antioch and Athens, as formerly the affairs of the Hellenes had been divided between two cities, Sparta and Athens.[2] We need not believe the words of an enthusiastic rhetor, who boasted that his school had supplied with rhetoricians three continents and all the islands as far as the Pillars of Hercules, but we may claim that Antioch with a few cities of Asia Minor had almost superseded Athens, Alexandria, and Constantinople as intellectual centers in the fourth century.[3] The Syrian Empress Julia Domna at the end of the second century, had a circle or salon in Antioch with such famous sophists and writers as Antipater and Flavius Philostratus.[4] The philosopher Iamblichus taught in Antioch and he lived in Daphne until his death.[5] Earlier in the first century B.C., Cicero himself celebrated the learned studies and the scholars and men of taste in all the genres who were numerous at Antioch.[6]

The gods themselves loved Antioch (ἡμῖν ἱραστὰι θεοί),

---

[1] Libanius Or. xxxi. 40.

[2] Ibid. xi. 184.

[3] Eunapius' The Lives of the Philosophers and Sophists, ed. and trans. W. C. Wright, Loeb Classical Library (London: W. Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1922), p. 322.

[4] Philostratus The Lives of the Sophists, ed. and trans. W. C. Wright, Loeb Classical Library (London: W. Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1922), p. x. Septimius Severus, the husband of Julia Domna, was a generous patron of letters, and Wright compares the court of Julia at Antioch to the Italian courts of the Renaissance.

[5] Malalas, p. 312.

[6] Cicero Pro Archia 3 in Oeuvres complètes, ed. and trans. M. Nisard, II (Paris, 1875), 653: "celebri quondam urbe et copiosa, atque eruditissimus hominibus liberalissimisque studiis affluenti."

according to Libanius, and whereas they quarelled among themselves in other cities, here they have brought no quarrels.[1] Not only that, but in Antioch everything happened according to the will of the gods.[2] Even the gods of other countries loved to come and live in Antioch which became a hostel for the gods and could thus compete with Olympus, which was known only to the poets, while here the phenomenon was visible.[3]

It is significant in this connection that the sacred character of Daphne with its temple of Apollo has lingered long after the triumph of Christianity, so that a Christian writer like Malalas, who was perhaps an ecclesiastic,[4] writing in the sixth century speaks of Daphne as sacred (τοῖς οἰκοῦσι τὴν ἱερὰν Δαφνήν).[5]

While Antioch was the home of the gods, it played also a leading role in the life and fortunes of early Christianity. The name of Christians applied to the disciples first in Antioch, the activity of Peter and Paul, the sending out of missions, the fame of its bishops, martyrs, and saints, the monks and hermits on the neighboring mountain who lived in caves, huts or cisterns, the heresies that arose and the councils that were held in it are all too well-known.[6] Antioch could boast of a theological school

---

[1] Libanius Or. xi. 66-67.

[2] Ibid. xi. 85.

[3] Ibid. xi. 109 ff. The Cyprian gods wanted to come to Antioch and they came; Isis left Memphis and came to Antioch. Cf. Schultze, op. cit., p. 142: "From the Seleucids until Julian, all sorts of Greek, Roman, Egyptian, and Oriental deities found place in Antioch."

[4] Karl Krumbacher, Geschichte der Byzantinischen Litteratur (2d ed.; München, 1897), p. 325.

[5] Malalas, p. 278.

[6] Acts 2:26 for the name of Christians; 18:22, 23 for missions; Galatians 2:11 for Peter and Paul. Bouchier, op. cit., pp. 129 ff.; Müller, op. cit., p. 34.

side by side with the school of rhetoric, and some of its famous theologians and preachers--Lucian, Diodorus of Tarsus, John Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Nestorius, and Theodoret--were no less famous than the sophists and rhetoricians.[1] The Christians evidently were conscious of this superiority of their city and its precedence over the whole world, as illustrated by one of Chrysostom's homilies.[2]

It is interesting to make here a comparison between the onception of both, Libanius, the extreme representative of Hellenistic paganism, and his student Chrysostom, the severe and austere representative of Christianity, concerning what constituted the importance of their native city. The preceding pages have given us an idea of Libanius' conception especially as illustrated in the different passages of the Antiochicus.[3] Chrysostom seems to attack in a veiled form Libanius' conception in a few passages of his homilies; the following is the most evident and the most characteristic:

> When you wish to pronounce an encomium on the city, tell me not of the suburb of Daphne, nor of the height and multitude of its cypresses, nor of its fountains of waters, nor of the great population who inhabit the city, nor of the great freedom with which its market place is frequented even to midnight, nor of the abundance of its wares . . . mention virtue, meekness . . . prayers, sobriety.[4]

---

[1] Bouchier, op. cit., pp. 140 ff.

[2] Chrysostom Homilies on St. Matthew vii. 7: "and you, when there is a question of precedence, claim to take the place of the whole world . . . but in the competition of chastity you are not ashamed to be behind the rudest cities."

[3] The Antiochicus or Oration xi was written and partly delivered in 360 A.D.

[4] Homilies on the Statues xvii. 14. Chrysostom was referring to the descriptions found in the Antiochicus of Libanius.

When he tells the Antiochenes the real dignity of their city, he speaks of the role it played in the early Christian church;[1] and as if desiring to make a parallel to the pagan gods who chose to live in Antioch according to Libanius, Chrysostom speaks of the different apostles and saints who lived in Antioch by the will of God, as for example St. Peter whom "God bade tarry here for a long period; thus in His sight our city was equivalent to the whole world."[2]

Putting aside the fancy of zealous rhetoricians and homilists regarding the favors of gods and saints, and coming down to historical facts, we see that Antioch enjoyed the unusual solicitude of kings, emperors, and Roman governors. This solicitude was marked especially by buildings and foundations of all kinds and for all purposes--material well-being, worship, and entertainment--temples, theatres, and hippodromes, forums, porticoes, aqueducts, and baths. All liked to ingratiate themselves with the Antiochenes by erecting some public structure.[3] A long record of that building activity especially under the Romans is to be found in Malalas, although one should be careful to distinguish between the different shades of his use of the word κτίζω .[4] Libanius gives important

---

[1] Ibid. xvii. 10. In the same passage Chrysostom says: "The dignity of a city is the virtue and piety of its people not its being a metropolis or having large and beautiful buildings and columns and porticoes and walls and being named in proclamations before other cities."

[2] Chrysostom Homily on St. Ignatius 4.

[3] Evagrius Ecclesiastical History i. 18 in The History of the Church until 594, trans. Edward Wells (2d ed.; London, 1709), p. 415, n. b.

[4] Downey, "Imperial Building Records in Malalas," Byzantinische Zeitschrift, XXXVIII (1938), 1-15, 299-311. The term κτίζω is used by Malalas for building operations often without differentiating if it is a new foundation, repairing, or rebuilding. Sometimes Malalas misinterprets the epigraphic

testimony to the building activity of the Seleucids and reaches the exaggerated conclusion, put in his usual rhetorical way, that "it would be easier to measure the water of the sea than to try to describe with words with what abundance of new foundations each enlarged the city."[1] Under the Romans, he says that Antioch enjoyed great advantages just as before, as if it were their own foundation.[2]

This solicitude of emperors is the more significant that it was manifested by emperors who had some reason to be disaffected with the city.[3] Marcus Aurelius, Septimius Severus, and Theodosius were among the benefactors to the city in spite of the rebellions that took place under their rule.[4] What is more significant is that when Julian himself was insulted and made fun of by the people of Antioch,[5] he wrote a satire against them, it is true, but in it he is highly concerned about his reputation and tries to explain his behavior in their city, and insists on asking them in pathetic terms the reasons of their hatred of him.[6] On

---

material which gave more credit to persons than they actually did, and sometimes he cites inscriptions from literary sources, without seeing the actual inscription. Cf. Downey, "Quintus Marcius Rex at Antioch," Classical Philology, XXXII (1937), 149; "The Work of Antonimus Pius at Antioch," Classical Philology, XXXIV (1939), 369 ff.

[1]Libanius Or. xi. 126, 105, 120, 124-125: "All the kings were thoughtful of that same thing, that each should transmit the city bigger than that which he received."

[2]Ibid. xi. 130.

[3]Benzinger, op. cit., recognizes that the Caesars competed in beautifying Antioch in spite of the frequent rebellions of the people, because they liked to stay there.

[4]See their building activity in Malalas, pp. 282, 294, 346 respectively.

[5]Julian Misopogon 356A, 357.

[6]Ibid. 365.

the other hand we see that the misfortunes of Antioch affected the emperors very deeply. Malalas gives a testimony to the deep grief caused by the earthquake of 526 at the court in Constantinople. The Emperor Justin went to church without his crown, lamenting (δίχα διαδήματος ... κλαίων), and with him the senators. The spectacles were suspended in the city.[1]

Such was Antioch which the Jewish doctors often cited when they wanted to mark something great,[2] and whose fame lingered late into the Middle Ages and made the Arabs, as Yaqūt says, attribute anything they admired to Antioch.[3] Libanius wonders "in what land or sea the fame of this city has not entered,"[4] and sums up its importance at the end of his encomium by saying: "What city is worth comparing to this?" (τίνα δὴ ταύτῃ πόλιν παραβάλλειν ἄξιον ;)[5]

Great center of Hellenism and of Christianity, capital, first of the House of Seleucus, then political and military metropolis of the Roman East, great commercial center and a significant highway for trade, no wonder Antioch was a very cosmopolitan city. "Attractions of all kinds bring people from all sides," says Libanius, "from Africa, Europe, Asia, from the Islands, from the mainland. . . ."[6] No wonder its population was so mixed and

---

[1]Malalas, p. 421.

[2]Krauss, "Antioche," op. cit., p. 31.

[3]Yaqūt, I, 382: كانت العرب اذا اعجبها شيء نسبته الى انطاكية

[4]Libanius Or. i. 2.

[5]Ibid. xi. 270.

[6]Ibid. xi. 264; Baur, op. cit., I, 29; Diehl, op. cit., p. 81 says: "Its environment was open to all influences, curious for all novelties."

its social life so intense. Enjoying the favor of kings and emperors with foundations for all sorts of enjoyment, and conscious of its own political, military, economic, religious, and cultural significance, no wonder the character of its people was rather unusual.

CHAPTER II

THE POPULATION OF ANTIOCH

ORIGINS AND SIZE

The question of the population of Antioch, including the problem of its origins, its evolution throughout the Hellenistic-Roman period, its race, nationality, and language, has been a puzzle for historians and writers on the Hellenistic world in general, and on Antioch in particular. In this and the next chapters we shall study these problems and make an attempt to reach a solution for them within the limitations of our literary, archaeological and epigraphic source material.

The First Inhabitants of Antioch

The legends and different stories connected with the foundation of Antioch are very instructive and helpful in studying the origins of the Antiochene population. A brief mention of some of these legends along with the archaeological discoveries that have been made in the last decades would help us draw some interesting conclusions regarding the first inhabitants of the site.

The legend of Io, daughter of Inachus, king of Argos, running away from her homeland, and of Triptolemus with the Argives sent to look for her, is too well-known to be related here in detail. Certain relevant parts of it, however, need to be noted. Libanius speaks of Triptolemus and the Argives climbing the mountain above the site of Antioch, where there were few inhabitants, approaching their dwellings, and knocking at their

doors asking for Io; they received hospitable presents from the dwellers, were seized by a yearning for this land, and so they settled, abandoning their search and their home, for they were ordered to bring the maiden with them, or not to come back.[1] Triptolemus settled his followers at the foot of the mountain, made a temple for Zeus in the name of Nemesis, and called the city Ione (Ἰώνην).[2]

Malalas relates the legend in slightly different terms; for he says that while Triptolemus with the sons of Inachus were staying on Mount Silpius and knocking at each house saying, "let the soul of Io be saved" (ψυχὴ Ἰοῦς σωξέσθω), they heard in a dream a human voice saying, "I am Io"; so they built a temple and with it the City of Iopolis.[3] Malalas says: "Those who built Iopolis were called by the Syrians Ionites until now" (οἵτινες ἐκλήθησαν παρὰ τοῖς αὐτοῖς Σύροις Ἰωνῖται ἕως τῆς νῦν).[4] Malalas adds that the Antiochene Syrians (οἱ οὖν Σύροι Ἀντιοχεῖς), from the date when the Argives came asking for Io until his day, made a remembrance at the same time every year, knocking at the houses of the Hellenes.[5] Suidas, on the other hand, gives a slight variation; he mentions the flight of Io to Mount Silpius and her death there. Her father and her brother learning of this, built

---

[1]Libanius Or. xi. 47: ἀνήεσαν ἐπὶ τὸ ὄρος παρὰ τοὺς ἐνοικοῦντας ὀλίγους δή τινας καὶ προσιόντες ταῖς οἰκίαις ... τυχόντες δὲ ξενίου καί τινα πόθον πρὸς τὴν γῆν λαβόντες....

[2]Ibid. xi. 47-51. There was in Argolis a temple of Nemean Zeus.

[3]Malalas, p. 28.

[4]Ibid., p. 29.

[5]Ibid: κρούοντες ... εἰς τοὺς οἴκους τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἕως ἄρτι.

her a temple and named the place Iopolis and remained there until their death, celebrating her memory and knocking at the doors of one another every year saying, "Io, Io."[1] Strabo mentions briefly the Argives and Triptolemus giving up the search for Io and settling in the Orontes country, after some of their companions had left them to found Tarsus.[2] Stephanus of Byzantium says simply concerning Ione: "Thus was called Antioch near Daphne which the Argives built."[3]

Both Libanius and Malalas speak of other peoples of Greek origin who came to inhabit the site. Casus, a brave man, according to Libanius, came from Crete and was followed by the most distinguished Cretans; he lived for a time on that same mountain applying the laws of Triptolemus. He wanted, however, to give the city a greater orientation, so he sought the good will of the Cyprians and married the daughter of Salaminus, ruler of Cyprus, with whom many Cyprians came.[4] Malalas speaks of Casus and the Cretans in essentially the same terms, except that he makes him the son of Inachus and a king, and mentions the name of his wife Amyce, called also Kitia; the Cypriots who came with her settled on the Acropolis and the country was called Amyce.[5]

The Heraclids also, in their banishment, put an end to their hardships and founded Heracleia, making an addition to the

---

[1] Suidas, op. cit., I, 1021: Καὶ κρούοντες εἰς τὰς ἀλλήλων θύρας κατ' ἔτος ἔλεγον Ἰώ Ἰώ.

[2] Strabo xvi. 750.

[3] Stephanus of Byzantium, op. cit., p. 343.

[4] Libanius Or. xi. 52-54.

[5] Malalas, p. 200.

city.[1] Ione enjoyed respect since the time of the Assyrians and Persians, according to Libanius, for Meroe (Μερόη) the wife of Cambyses gave her name to the place because she sacrificed in the temple of Artemis built by Semiramis, queen of Assyria; Meroe is said to have enlarged the temple and endowed it.[2]

When Alexander of Macedon came to the site after the Battle of Issus, he drank from a spring which he called Olympias, after his mother, and began building a city, we are told; the first settlement was a temple dedicated to Zeus Bottiaeus and a castle called Emathia (Ἡμαθία).[3]

A great many inferences can be drawn from these legends and one can consider them in a multitude of ways. They can be considered as an attempt to prove that Antioch was not a parvenue of Macedonian creation but one of the first born Greek colonies.[4]

---

[1]Libanius Or. xi. 56. Malalas, p. 204 mentions a city "once called Heraclea, now Daphne (Ἡρακλείδα τὴν ποτὲ πόλιν), and cypresses planted by a certain Heracles, the one who built Daphne by his name and called it Heraclea. He then corrects the confusion of Heraclea and Daphne by saying: "Heraclea was built outside a grove near the temple of Athena, for the temple of Apollo is called Daphne and is in the middle of the grove."

[2]Libanius Or. xi. 59-60.

[3]Ibid. xi. 72 ff. The water of that spring, the tradition says, was so fresh that it reminded him of his mother's milk. Malalas, p. 200 mentions the village of Bottia (Βοττία) opposite Iopolis. Leo Hugi, Der Antiochikos des Libanios (Solothurn, 1919), p. 128, n. 76 mentions Emathia and Bottia as localities in Macedonia. Babelon, op. cit., p. xi says Pella, the capital of Macedonia was in the territory of Bottia, hence Zeus of Pella was called Zeus Bottiaeus, and Alexander had a special cult for this Zeus. Seleucus had Zeus Bottiaeus on his coins: see Pl. I, No. 2; this Zeus has an eagle in the right hand, while Zeus Olympius has a Nike instead.

[4]Bevan, op. cit., I, 212; Bouchier, op. cit., p. 58 says that Greek myth was laid under contribution in this attempt; F. Durrbach, "Io," Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines, ed. Daremberg and Saglio, Vol. III, Part I (1900), believes that these traditions are from a time when the Greeks were making parallels between their legends and those of the Orient.

One could see in them an attempt on the part of certain Antiochenes, particularly Libanius, to glorify their noble descent and affiliate themselves, not only with the Attic Ionians, but with "the best that was ever found in one place," and to prove that, to the Antiochenes only,[1] the founders united what is worthy of esteem in the home of each: "the antiquity of the Argives, the good laws of the Cretans, the kingly origin of the Cyprians, and the descent from Heracles."[2] One could see also an attempt to identify places in Antioch with places familiar to Greeks and Macedonians in their homeland in about the same way in which Hebrew writers liked to identify the site of Antioch and Daphne with places familiar to the Jews from ancient tradition such as Hamath and Ribla, to create the impression to later Jews that the presence of their kinsmen was self evident and goes back beyond the Macedonian conquest.[3]

This is not all. Reading the tradition of Io, we find that both Malalas and Libanius speak of older inhabitants on the site where Iopolis was founded and who must have been Arameans or some other native Syrians. Recent excavation has shown that the plain of Antioch, or the ʿAmk (written also ʿAmuq) plain, has been occupied since prehistoric times, and in the course of the first

---

[1] Libanius Or. xi. 57 says: μόνοις ἡμῖν .

[2] Ibid.

[3] Kraeling, op. cit., p. 131. For an explanation of these identifications see Krauss, "Antioche," op. cit., pp. 29-31. For Antioch and Daphne as stations of Babylonian exile in the history of rabbinic Judaism see Le Talmud de Jérusalem, trans. Moise Schwab, V (Paris, 1878), 306: "When Nebuchadnezzar went [to Palestine], he fixed his residence at Daphne of Antioch." Monumenta Talmudica, ed. S. Funk, I (Vienna, 1913), 125: "They led him [the king's executioner] to the king of Babel in Ribla [ii Kings 25:16], and R. Abahn said, 'this was Antioch.'" (רבלתה זי שנטרכיא).

millenium, before the Macedonian conquest, the region was inhabited by Syro-Hittites, Arameans, and Kurds.[1] On the other hand, the results of recent archaeological work published by Dussaud and Schaeffer on Ras-Shamra, and by L. Woolley on Al-Mina seem to show that the stories related by Libanius and Malalas have some foundation of truth, and that the souvenir of old Greek elements living in northern Syria around the lower course of the Orontes, lingering in the accounts of chroniclers, geographers, and writers as late as the sixth century A.D., is not without justification.[2] The name Ione or Iopolis which the legend derives

---

[1]Robert J. Braidwood, Mounds in the Plain of Antioch (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1937), pp. 20-36 for a list of the mounds in that plain; pp. 6-7 for chronology of levels in one of the mounds. Woolley, op. cit., p. 2 on these mounds. Sidney Smith, "The Greek Trade at Al-Mina," The Antiquaries Journal, XXII (1942), 92 on the state of Beit Agusi, capital Arpad, client of Urartu in the eighth century B.C. before the Assyrians came. R. A. Bowman, "Arameans, Aramaic, and the Bible," Journal of Near Eastern Studies, VII (1948), 71 speaks of twelve thousand Ahlame Arameans settled by Tigleth-Pileser III in northern Syria. Professor Bowman was kind enough to show the writer a few potsherds from the site of Tell-taʿyīnāt in the ʿAmk plain bearing fragmentary Aramaic inscriptions, as yet unpublished. Dussaud, Topographie, p. 425 speaks of nomadic Kurds dominating the plain when Alexander came, who were originally introduced by the Assyrians.

[2]René Dussaud, "Note additionnelle aux fouilles de Minet-el-Beida et de Ras-Shamra," Syria, X (1929), 297-303 speaks of a Cypriot colony with Cypriots and Aegeans in the second half of the second millenium B.C. at Ras-Shamra and Minet-el-Beida; he maintains that the civilization of the Mount Casius region in northern Syria was closely related to the neighboring Cypriot coast according to the discoveries of Schaeffer and Chenet; he says that the Cypriots went inland to keep the passage of the Orontes, and that they were reinforced by Aegeans, especially Cretans. Referring to the passage of Malalas (p. 200) Dussaud says that Malalas puts eponyms of cities and countries; for Casus is the Mount Casius, and as son of Inachus, he is connected with Argolis (Mycenean products were seen in the excavations); Casus marries Kitia, eponym of Citium in Cyprus; she was daughter of Salaminus, eponym of Salamis in Cyprus, important center in the Mycenean period; he brings with him Cretans and Cypriots to colonize the Casius region; the name Amyce is given to Kitia referring to the expansion of the Aegeans to the plain of Antioch. This attempt of Dussaud to confirm the results of archaeological discovery by an old legend, was made similarly by Woolley, op. cit., pp. 1-15; Woolley wants the passage of Malalas to refer not to Ras-Shamra, but to Al-Mina, at

from Io should not surprise us in view of the fondness for eponyms among ancient writers.[1] The settlement was called Ione by the Syrian inhabitants of the region meaning the "city of the Greeks or Ionians" who were known under the name Javan or Iamani.[2]

In these legends, moreover, we see that Malalas makes a distinction between the Hellenes and the Syrians from the time

---

the mouth of the Orontes, and its residential quarter, Sabuni, three miles uphill, both of which he believes to be the old Posideium mentioned by Herodotus (iii. 91) as a Greek colony of the heroic age. Woolley maintains that the link of Al-Mina and Tell-Atchana in the Amk plain is implicit in the legend of Malalas; to him and to Evans, quoted by him, Al-Mina was the town founded by Casus at the foot of the mountain bearing his name, and Amyce is the ʿAmk where Atchana lies; so tradition, he says, knew of some kind of traffic between Atchana and the sea since the seventeenth century B.C.

Whether the legend refers to Al-Mina or to Ras-Shamra, and without having to admit literally all the results of these two scholars, for our purposes, both interpretations attest a certain old connection of Cretan, Cypriot, and Argive settlers and traders with the Amk plain and the region of Antioch.

[1]Strabo xvi. 750 speaks of the river Typhon called Orontes by the name of the man who built a bridge across it. It is interesting to notice that Greek writers have given Greek eponyms even to Semitic cities of old date. Stephanus of Byzantium, op. cit., p. 217 says that Damascus was named after Damascus the son of Hermes who came from Arcadia with his wife Halimede, or because one of the giants, Askus (Ἄσκος) with Lycurgus bound Dionysus and threw him in the river, but Hermes delivered him and stripped Askus of his skin. On the other hand, Yaqūt is inclined to connect many cities mentioned in his geographical dictionary with some eponym descendant from Sām, son of Nūh (Shem son of Noah). Speaking of Damascus (Dimashq), Yaqūt, op. cit., II, 587, states in one of the traditions that it was named after Damasheq, son of Qani, son of Malek, son of Arfakhshed, son of Sām, son of Nūh. Even Antioch, in one of his traditions, op. cit., I, 382, is said to have been founded by Antakiya, daughter of Rum, son of Aliqan, son of Sām, son of Nūh, وقيل اول من بناها وسكنط انطاكية بنت الروم بن اليقن بن سام بن نوح an interesting combination of ancestors uniting a Greek eponym (Rum meaning Greeks in Arabic terminology) and a Semitic one.

[2]D. D. Luckenbill, Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1927), II, 273, No. 710, mention by Esarhaddon of "the kings of the midst of the sea from Iadanana, which is Javan"; ibid., p. 31, No. 62, under Sargon II ca. 715 B.C., mention of Iamani chosen to rule in Ashdod. Sidney Smith, op. cit., p. 99 goes to the extent of thinking this Yamani or Iamani to have come to Ashdod from Al-Mina.

Iopolis was founded until his time, or the time of the source he was copying,[1] which would mean a recognition of race consciousness among Greeks and Syrians, if the text of Malalas is not confused; for the context does not seem natural, and one would not be able to explain why the Syrians celebrate the memory of Io and knock at the doors of the Greeks. One would rather admit the tradition reported by Suidas which seems more reasonable and says that the founders of Iopolis knock at one another's door, although we are ignorant of its origin.[2]

Malalas seems to show us, moreover, that some of the inhabitants were still living on the Acropolis under Caesar, and that the name of Iopolis was still known under Tiberius.[3]

As for the settlement of Alexander, whether its name is Emathia or Bottia, it is not impossible that Alexander left some veterans in that fertile region after the Battle of Issus, according to his habit later of settling veterans and mercenaries unfit for service when he did not choose to send them back home.[4]

When Seleucus Nicator built the city of Antioch on the

---

[1]Malalas, p. 29.

[2]Suidas, op. cit., I, 1021; Bouchier, Syria as a Roman Province (Oxford, 1916), p. 61 could not explain why the Syrians should knock at the doors of the Ionites.

[3]Malalas, p. 216: "Caesar built on the Acropolis on the mountain of Antioch a public bath for the Acropolitans"; ibid., p. 233: "The wall made under Tiberius enclosed that of Seleucus . . . and the mountain with the Acropolis and Iopolis."

[4]Arrian Anabasis of Alexander, ed. and trans. E. Iliff Robson, Loeb Classical Library (2 vols.; London: W. Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1929) vii. 21. 7: Alexandria-on-the-Euphrates was populated by Greek mercenaries, by those who, through age or wounds, were unfit for service, and by those who volunteered; ibid. iv. 22. 4: Alexandria-in-the-Caucasus was peopled by veterans and natives. Strabo xvi. 752 tells us that Apamea was called Pella by the first Macedonian settlers.

plain between Silpius and the Orontes, he undoubtedly resorted to a kind of synoecism of the existing settlements.[1] The Macedonians of Bottia must have been incorporated in the new foundation, as well as the settlers on the mountain. Malalas refers to him bringing down the Cretans[2] whom Casus had left on the mountain, with the Cypriots and the Argive Ionites from the city of Iopolis; he made them citizens (πολιτευομένους ἐποίησεν) because they were sacred or priestly (ἱερατικούς) and of good birth (εὐγενεῖς).[3]

An important part of the population of Antioch came from Antigoneia, which Antigonus had founded in 306 B.C., to the northeast of the new site. Diodorus tells us that Antigoneia did not stand long, for Seleucus destroyed it "and transported its inhabitants to the city built by himself, and called Seleuceia after himself."[4] This latter part of Diodorus' statement seems to be either a corruption of his text or a mistake of Diodorus, and the statement must have been supposedly: "to the city built by himself and called Antiocheia after his father."[5] Libanius speaks of the destruction of Antigoneia and the transfer of its inhabitants,

---

[1]Malalas, p. 200 says that Seleucus built his city on the plain where the village of Bottia stood.

[2]It is noteworthy that the Slavonic version of Malalas has translated Κρῆτας as "judge" and the modern translators of this version have rendered it thus: "Seleucus brought a judge from the Acropolis," without mentioning that either the version they were translating, or its original text was corrupt. The Chronicle of John Malalas, trans. M. Spinka and G. Downey, p. 14.

[3]Malalas, p. 201.

[4]Diodorus xx. 47.

[5]Diodorus, ed. Fischer, V (Leipzig: Teubner, 1906), 244. Fischer proposes: ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκείνου κληθεῖσαν Ἀντιόχειαν instead of ἀπ' ἐκείνου δὲ κληθεῖσαν Σελεύκειαν. Müller, op. cit., p. 28, n. 6 says: "The text of Diodorus is corrupt, and we do not know what he meant." Benzinger, op. cit., believes it was a mistake of Diodorus.

among whom there were Athenians, to Antioch.[1] Malalas mentions the same event, but refers not only to Athenians, but to Macedonians among those who were transported, and even mentions the number of the whole group, 5300 persons. (ἐποίησε μετοικῆσαι τοὺς Ἀθηναίους εἰς ἣν ἔκτισε πόλιν Ἀντιόχειαν τὴν μεγάλην τοὺς οἰκοῦντας τὴν Ἀντιγονίαν. οὕστινας ἦν ἐκεῖ ἐάσας Ἀντίγονος μετὰ Δημητρίου υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἄλλους δὲ Μακεδόνας τοὺς πάντας ἄνδρας ,ΣΤ').[2]

An echo of this operation of synoecism is to be found in the anonymous Arab writer who speaks of the destruction of the towns that were around Antioch and of the villages near it, whose number was seven and of the transportation of their population to it.[3] We do not know what the other settlements or villages destroyed were, nor do we know what was the attitude of the synoecized settlements towards this operation of Seleucus.[4] Libanius, the proud citizen of Antioch says that the Antigoneians knew that the new place was better, so they honored Seleucus by a copper statue with bull-horns, a token of Io.[5] Whereas Malalas mentions

---

[1] Or. xi. 92: Ἀντιγονίαν δὲ αὐτὴν μὲν ἠφάνισεν...τὸ δὲ πλήρωμα δεῦρο μετέστησεν, ἐν οἷς ἦσαν καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι.

One must notice that Libanius was not interested in the other elements and so he mentioned Athenians particularly.

[2] Malalas, p. 201.

[3] Descrizione araba, p. 144: وأمر فاخربت المدن والقرى التي كانوا حول انطاكية وكانوا سبع مدن وامر فاخربت المدن التي كانوا حولها والقرى التي كانت بالقرب منها ونقل الجميع اليها.

[4] For the feeling of synoecised communities in general and the city patriotism of many of them hurt by synoecism, see Tscherikower, op. cit., pp. 195 ff.

[5] Libanius Or. xi. 92.

that Seleucus established a copper statue of Athena, on account of the Athenians who worshipped her.[1] This is not unlikely in view of the favors which founders often accorded to the settled communities.[2] One should not suppose, however, that these synoecised settlements were utterly destroyed. Cassius Dio mentions Antigoneia standing in the middle of the first century B.C.,[3] and Malalas mentions Iopolis under Tiberius.[4]

The sources tell us nothing about the settlement of native Syrians in Antioch, their primary interest being to register the coming of Greek elements into the city. However, the stories related by Malalas on the Ionites and the Syrians and the celebration of the memory of Io since that time[5] prove that they were living side by side. It is, moreover, unlikely that Seleucus could have prevented the native elements, whether on the Acropolis or nearby in the plain, from living in the city. We would rather incline to the belief that he invited them to live in Antioch following the tradition of Alexander who established natives in most of his settlements, and especially in Alexandria.[6]

---

[1]Malalas, p. 201.

[2]Descrizione araba, p. 144 conserves for us a vague memory of what Seleucus did for the inhabitants: "He exempted them from taxes for three years, and allotted to them all dwellings, shops, orchards, and lands, so that anyone who has anything planted around it or built in it will not be disturbed by anybody."

[3]C. Dio xl. 29. The Parthians failing to take Antioch turned to Antigoneia ca. 51 B.C.

[4]Malalas, pp. 216, 233. [5]Ibid., p. 29.

[6]Curtius Quintus History of Alexander, ed. and trans. John C. Rolfe, Loeb Classical Library (2 vols.; Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press; London: W. Heinemann, 1946) iv. 8. 5: "Having ordered the inhabitants of the neighboring cities to move to Alexandria, he filled the new city with a great population." Diodorus xvii. 83 says that among those established in Alexandria-in-the-Caucasus were seven thousand natives.

Tscherikower reminds us of another possible reason for inviting the native population to join in the new foundation when he speaks of the necessity of the propagation of the new population, and the creation of an atmosphere of domesticity which could not be done with Macedonian veterans and restless mercenaries, but only with the native element, especially women, because a mass emigration of Greek and Macedonian families was out of the question.[1] Tscherikower was thinking essentially of the eastern provinces where no Greek families existed. The situation around Antioch must have been different, and in the synoecised settlements there must have been several Greek or mixed families. Moreover, one would hardly think of Seleucus bringing to his city a mass of women only, unless they were within a whole group of native families.

Strabo mentions the foundation of the second quarter of Antioch in a rather vague manner. While speaking of the founder of each of the four quarters or settlements of Antioch, which he calls a tetrapolis, he says that Seleucus Nicator founded the first of the settlements, transferring thither the settlers from Antigoneia. As for the second, he says: "It was founded by the multitude of the settlers." (τοῦ πλήθους τῶν οἰκητόρων ἐστι κτίσμα.)[2] It is difficult to tell what he meant by "the multitude of the settlers." We can hardly think of Seleucus creating a first quarter for those whom he brought from Antigoneia, leaving

---

[1]Tscherikower, op. cit., p. 194.

[2]Strabo xvi. 750. Bevan, op. cit., I, 212 renders this statement thus: "by the resident population," which does not convey the exact meaning of Strabo. The term οἰκητόρων might mean "inhabitants" but from the way Strabo used it for those whom he brought from Antigoneia, it could mean "settlers from other places," for Strabo in connection with Antigoneia had said: μεταγαγὼν ἐκ τῆς Ἀντιγονείας τοὺς οἰκήτορας.

the elements coming from the other settlements create their own quarter. In any case, as far as the settlers are concerned, Strabo must have meant either the people from the other synoecised settlements around Antioch, or the native settlers, who must have been numerous as indicated by the word πλήθους .

Among the early residents of Antioch under Seleucus, Josephus mentions the Jewish residents who are called Antiochenes, having been granted rights of citizenship by the founder Seleucus.[1] These privileges are explained by the fact that the Jews had shown their good will to the Macedonian conquerors, and being numerous in Babylonia, they were probably known to Seleucus as industrious and law abiding.[2] Recent research on the subject has shown, however, that the statements of Josephus were written in an apologetic spirit,[3] and are contradicted by another statement in which there is no mention of these old privileges but of later privileges given by the kings after Antiochus who is supposed to be Antiochus III.[4] Josephus, moreover, did not seem to distinguish

---

[1]Josephus C. Apion ii. 4. 39; Josephus believed also that Alexander presented a quarter in Alexandria to the Jews who obtained privileges like other Macedonians: ibid. ii. 4. 35; in Antiquities xii. 3. 19, Josephus mentions again Seleucus granting the Jews citizenship in the cities he founded in Asia and in Antioch and declaring them to have equal privileges; his proof of this was that he gave orders that the Jews unwilling to use foreign oil should receive a fixed sum of money from the gymnasiarchs to pay for their own oil.

[2]Bouchier, History of Antioch, p. 20.

[3]Ralph Marcus in Josephus Works, ed. Loeb Classical Library, VII, Appendix C, 739. Bevan, op. cit., II, 166 says that the statements of Josephus were made in an age of prolific forgery among the Jews.

[4]Josephus Jewish Wars vii. 3. 43: "The Jews congregated in Antioch for the greatness of the city but mainly because the kings after Antiochus enabled them to live in security, for although Epiphanes sacked the temple, his successors restored to the Jews of Antioch the votive offerings of brass, and granted them citizen rights on an equality with the Greeks." For the identity

between the religious privileges of a community, and the privileges of citizenship.[1] And besides, there was not enough diaspora in Syria under the early Seleucids to make the grant of such privileges necessary. Professor Marcus who made a special study of this question of Jewish citizen rights under the early Seleucids in Syria and Asia in general, concludes his study by saying: "It is very improbable that Jewish communities in Seleucid Syria and Asia were granted either citizenship or special privileges before the time of Antiochus III."[2] On the other hand, it is permitted to suppose that the Jews of Babylonia, who were more numerous than in other places, could have taken part in the wars of Seleucus, and some of them might have settled in Antioch with other veterans and obtained citizen rights like the other veterans.[3]

The Evolution of the Population During the Seleucid and Roman Periods

Thus the early inhabitants of Antioch present themselves to us as veterans, chiefly Macedonians, settled by Seleucus or invited from the earlier settlements of Bottia and Antigoneia, Athenians from Antigoneia, and, if we are to believe the implications of the legends supplemented by the results of excavation, Argives, Cretans, and Cypriots from earlier settlements, with a number of native Syrians from the regions of the north Orontes and

---

of the King Antiochus mentioned in this text see Marcus, op. cit., VII, 739 who believes that he was Antiochus III and not Antiochus I as Thackeray had said in op. cit., III, 517, n. c.

[1]Marcus, op. cit., VII, 741; Kraeling, op. cit., p. 138.

[2]Marcus, op. cit., VII, 742; for the question of Jewish diaspora in Syria and Asia cf. Tscherikower, op. cit., p. 206; Bevan, op. cit., II, 165.

[3]Cf. Kraeling, op. cit., p. 138.

the immediate neighborhood of Antioch.

The foundation of Seleucus grew in size and in number of population under the Seleucids, and later under the Romans. One of the sources of this increasing population was emigration from the Greek world. The opportunities afforded in the new country coupled with the sufferings of the Greeks at home, undoubtedly induced the Greeks to emigrate.[1] One could see a running theme justifying this emigration in the words of Libanius, when relating the legends of the early foundation of Antioch. We know that Libanius meant chiefly to glorify Antioch and its Hellenic tradition in his eleventh oration, yet one can read in his statements a whole philosophy of Greek emigration and of Greek colonization in general in this age. When he speaks of Triptolemus and the Argives forfeiting their home by their free will, abandoning their search for Io, he adds: "Because often, a better country attracts the inclination of men and drives the memory of the fatherland."[2] And when Casus comes with his Cretans, he found the Argives better than the people at home, for Minos, by envy, drove them, while the Argives welcomed them.[3] This, not only symbolizes the fact that Greeks were driven to emigrate by envy, poverty, and political disputes, but tells us also about the welcome of Greeks in the country to other Greeks. Casus, marrying the daughter of King Salaminus in Cyprus,[4] means that the Greeks, once established in the new country, sought to strengthen their relations with other

---

[1]Rostovtzeff, The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World, I, 141 ff. Bevan, op. cit., I, 209.

[2]Libanius Or. xi. 50: ὅτι πολλάκις χῶρος ἐπισπασάμενος γνώμας ἀνθρώπων ἐξέβαλε τῆς ἐνιγκούσης τὴν μνήμην.

[3]Ibid. xi. 52.

[4]Ibid. xi. 54.

parts of the Greek world. And finally, the Heraclids putting an end to their hardships by founding Heracleia,[1] gives a picture of the sea-faring Greek looking for a convenient place to settle.

Libanius speaks of a new city built on the island in the Orontes by Antiochus III and populated by Aetolians, Cretans, and Euboeans.[2] Strabo had already mentioned a third quarter built by Seleucus II Callinicus without mentioning its building on the island.[3] The two seem to be the same, Callinicus beginning the new foundation, and Antiochus III his son completing it.[4] The Aetolians and a number of Greek mercenaries fighting on the side of Antiochus III, were left to themselves after his defest in the Battle of Magnesia 189 B.C., so he settled them on the island and peopled the new quarter.[5] Some have seen in the defeat of Antiochus III and in the Treaty of Apamea with the resulting loss of Asia Minor and the establishment of Roman influence in the Greek motherland, the end of Greek immigration in Seleucid Asia.[6] One thing is certain; it was no more possible for the Seleucids to invite large groups of population from Asia Minor and the rest of the Greek world to settle in their cities, but we are not sure if

---

[1] Ibid. xi. 56.

[2] Ibid. xi. 119: Καὶ τοῦτο μὲν τὴν νεωτέραν τῆς πόλεως... ἣ ὁ ποταμὸς περιλαμβάνει, προσκατασκευάσται γένος μὲν Ἑλληνικὸν εἰσάγων, Αἰτωλοὺς καὶ Κρῆτας καὶ Εὐβοεῖς.

[3] Strabo xvi. 750.

[4] Bevan, op. cit., I, 213; Bouchier, History of Antioch, p. 30; Morey, op. cit., p. 5.

[5] Bevan, op. cit., II, 82; Morey, op. cit., p. 5.

[6] Jones, op. cit., p. 248.

individuals would have been prevented from coming and settling in Antioch and other cities of Syria. When Epiphanes held the festival of Daphne, Polybius tells us that he sent out embassies and sacred missions to the towns to announce the games, "so that the people in Greece were very eager to come to him."[1] Malalas mentions, regarding the Olympic games of Antioch after their organization by Commodus, that people came from every city and land (ἰκάστης πόλεως καὶ χώρας) and that the size of the crowd that came depended upon the winds in the sea,[2] which means that they came from overseas, and essentially from the Greek Islands and mainland. Now, nothing, we believe, would have prevented those Greek and Macedonian visitors from staying if the Seleucid and, later, the Roman rulers had wanted them to stay.[3]

The fourth quarter of Antioch, according to Strabo, was built by Antiochus IV Epiphanes.[4] Malalas says that Epiphanes erected it outside the city near the mountain and it was called Epiphaneia after him.[5] This, however, was not the end of the expansion of Antioch. Later under the Romans, Agrippa, son-in-law of Augustus, built the Agrippian neighborhood, and in the time of Theodosius, the city already had dwellings outside the walls for

---

[1]Polybius xxx. 25; Athenaeus v. 194: ὡς πολλὴν γινέσθαι τῶν Ἑλλήνων σπουδὴν εἰς τὴν ὡς αὐτὸν ἄφιξιν.

Paton in Loeb edition and translation of Polybius, VI, 143 translates the latter part: "were very eager to visit Antioch."

[2]Malalas, pp. 287-289.

[3]We know that at least in one respect the coming of Greeks did not stop and that was in the importation of "pleasure women" from Athens which was a source of supply for the Hellenistic world. Cf. William Scott Ferguson, Hellenistic Athens (London, 1911), p. 70, who speaks of the traffic in courtesans, and of many beauties leaving Athens for the new lands.

[4]Strabo xvi. 750.

[5]Malalas, p. 222.

the distance of a mile, so that the emperor ordered his prefect Antiochus Khuzon to build a wall including the dwellings outside the town.[1]

The Seleucids, after settling their first Macedonian veterans in Antioch must have continued the practice, and it is not impossible that the army continued to be a source of the population of that city. Antiochus III settled one of his distinguished servants after a brilliant military life in Daphne, conferring on him the high priesthood of Apollo as a kind of reward.[2] The Seleucid army, being composed of mercenaries, and recruited from the whole country,[3] one can imagine the mixture of elements in it,[4] and the resulting mixture of the elements of the Antiochene population when some of these veterans were allowed to settle in the city. The simple example of the Galatian soldiers given to Berenice, wife of Antiochus II, in 246 B.C. as a bodyguard[5] would illustrate our point; for the members of such a bodyguard would naturally associate with the inhabitants and after retirement eventually settle in the city. The supply of Greek and Galatian soldiers, however, was stopped by the Treaty of Apamea, according to which the Seleucids were prevented from levying mercenaries in the lands under Roman domination.[6]

The influx of different elements into Antioch continued

---

[1]Malalas, p. 346. [2]Bevan, op. cit., I, 214.

[3]Bikerman, op. cit., p. 78.

[4]Polybius v. 79 on the Battle of Raphia in 217 B.C., and the different kinds of soldiers and national groups in the army; cf. xxx. 25 for the different elements of the army in the procession of Daphne 167 B.C.

[5]Polyaenus Strategmata viii. 5a ed. J. Melber (Leipzig, 1887).

[6]Polybius xxi. 42. 15 gives the text of this condition.

under the Romans. Among these elements were few Roman citizens. Some came for business, and Caesar refers to them in connection with their decision along with the people of Antioch to exclude Pompey after Pharsalus in 48 B.C.[1] Many came to serve in the different departments of the Roman administration.[2] We have already seen the great and varied number of persons who used to flock to Antioch, not only in the direct company of Roman emperors, but in connection with their stay, for lawsuits, embassies, business, or sight-seeing.[3] When Julian was justifying his action in fighting high prices, he said that he did it, not only to assist the mass of the people, but the strangers who kept arriving in the city on his account and on account of the officials who were with him.[4]

Malalas informs us about some senators (συγκλητικούς) sent by the emperors from Rome to live in Antioch, such as those two who came under Caligula "to guard the city and build it from the liberalities of the king and from their own funds and to live in it."[5] Antioch was even selected as residence for certain individuals by the Roman emperors themselves, such as Domitian who

---

[1]Caesar Civil Wars iii. 102: "Romanorum qui illic negotiarentur." W. T. Arnold, The Roman System of Provincial Administration (3d ed.; Oxford, 1914), p. 18 says that the Roman trader was ubiquitous; he even preceded Roman arms, sometimes he followed them.

[2]Paul Perdrizet, "Inscriptions d'Antioche," Bulletin de correspondance hellénique, XXIV (1900), 289.

[3]C. Dio lxviii. 24.

[4]Julian Misopogon 370 B: ταῖς ἀφικνουμένοις ξένοις ἐμοῦ τε ἕνεκα καὶ τῶν συνόντων ἡμῖν ἀρχόντων.

[5]Malalas, p. 243; Caligula became ultimately angry with them, confiscated their property and palaces, and brought them in chains.

sent Paris, the dancer of the green faction, to live in Antioch.[1]

It is thus obvious that the Romans who came to live in Antioch, came mostly for official and temporary business, and those who settled must have been relatively few. The military element, however, which was as mixed as under the Seleucids, associated with the population of Antioch, intermarried with them, and it is not unlikely that many of them settled ultimately in the city. Tacitus gives us very clear evidence on that association and intermarriage.[2] The long stay of certain legions, as the third legion Gallica,[3] could not help resulting in that association and ultimate settlement after retirement.

A great part of the population was furnished also by local emigration from the neighboring cities, or from the villages of the neighboring country. Libanius gives us a good picture of that emigration while glorifying the hospitality of Antioch when he says: "There is no city from which we have not received a part; those whom we have received hither from everywhere are not by much less than those left behind in each city . . . they flee their home and love ours."[4] Yet while boasting of this hospitality and of the fact that, while sitting in the market place, one could

---

[1]Malalas, p. 263.

[2]Tacitus The Histories ii. 80: In connection with the speech of Mucianus to the Antiochenes in the theatre after administering to his troops the oath of allegiance to Vespasian, Tacitus says: "For the provincials were accustomed to live with the soldiers and enjoyed association with them; in fact many civilians were bound to the soldiers by ties of friendship and marriage." In i. 46 Tacitus speaks of the usage of having a quarter of each company (manipuli) to be away on furlough, or loafing around the camp, and in this way they mixed with the population.

[3]Tacitus The Histories iii. 24.

[4]Libanius Or. xi. 164: οὐ γὰρ ἔστι πόλις, ἧς οὐ δεδέγμεθα μέρος ....

converse with people from everywhere, he shows us in other orations that he did not consider this immigration a great blessing, for many of the newcomers were fugitives from justice or from their trades, swelling the rabble element.[1] Chrysostom blames this element of strangers and adventurers for the sedition of 387 for which the whole city could not be held responsible.[2] These elements, as far as we know, were not hindered from coming to the city as in Egypt, where we have an official letter from Caracalla in 215 A.D., ordering the prefect to expel from Alexandria all Egyptians who flocked from the country districts except visitors and traders.[3]

We can consider this local emigration to Antioch as consisting essentially, if not completely, of native Syrians, although not necessarily of the type described by Libanius and Chrysostom. Some came as traders and visitors, others must have been driven by poverty and economic depression, or they had to leave their fields because of the cruel treatment of landowners described by Chrysostom himself in very vivid terms.[4] The phenomenon was a part of the general influx to the cities noticeable in the whole Roman Empire and especially in the City of Rome.

---

[1] Libanius Or. xli. 6 speaks of the theatre as a haunt of idlers driven from their cities by people they had injured: οὗτοι ξένοι πάντες εἰσὶ κακῶς διῦρο ἥκοντες ὑπ' αὐτῶν ὧν ἠδίκουν ἐκπεσόντες τῶν ἑαυτῶν πατρίδων.

[2] Chrysostom Homilies on the Statues iii. 3: ... ἀλλ' ἀνθρώπων τινῶν ξένων καὶ ἐπηλύδων.

[3] John Garrett Winter, Life and Letters in the Papyri (Ann Arbor, 1933), p. 21 refers to Giessen papyrus 40.

[4] Chrysostom Homilies on St. Matthew lxi. 3.

This continuous influx of native population from the neighboring regions was accompanied by the infiltration of Oriental peoples from the neighboring countries, especially as a result of political upheavals and temporary conquest. With the Jewish element, we shall deal very shortly. It is highly possible that in the troubled years of Seleucid rule in the first century B.C., a few Armenians must have settled under King Tigranes.[1] Some Arabs from the neighboring country, and occasionally a few Parthians in the short periods of incursion and temporary rule must have settled also.[2] The name of Artabanes[3] in this connection is significant. A great population of slaves must be added to this picture, coming from different races and countries, for the market of Delos was not far,[4] and evidence is not lacking on the numerous slave population of the city.[5]

Concerning the Jewish population of Antioch, we have already mentioned a rabbinic tradition that not only identifies Antioch with certain cities mentioned in the Bible as Hamath and Ribla, but mentions Antioch and Daphne as stations of Babylonian

---

[1]Justin xl. 1; Appian xi. 49; Dobias, Histoire de la province romaine de Syrie (Prague, 1924), p. 547. Tigranes ruled Antioch and a part of Syria 83-67 B.C.

[2]Strabo xiv. 668: Syria and Cilicia were at the mercy of the Parthians and of Armenia until Rome interfered. Dobias, op. cit., p. 550: Arab Sheikhs were almost masters of Syria; C. Dio xlviii. 24: the Parthians ruled Antioch 41-38 B.C.

[3]Malalas, pp. 289, 307 mentions Artabanes as a high dignitary in the Olympic games and as a magistrate. Beurlier, op. cit., p. 296 says that he must have been of Parthian origin, born in Antioch or established in it for a long time.

[4]Strabo xiv. 668.

[5]Chrysostom Homilies on I Corinthians xl. 6 blaming masters for employing many servants; Libanius Or. xxxi. 11 that three slaves are not too many for a middle class man; Or. xlvii. 28 that eleven slaves are too few for a high ranking officer.

exile.[1] The explanation for the latter is that many Jews came to Daphne actually with the high priest Onias III in the time of Antiochus III, and several captives were brought to Antioch in the time of the Seleucid and Roman wars in Palestine.[2] This political cause, however, was not the only one for their settlement in Antioch. The new city offered to them as well as to the other settlers many business opportunities, and our sources tell us that they were prosperous especially under the early Roman Empire, that among them there were some landowners,[3] and one of them at least is referred to as a magistrate.[4]

A part of the Jewish settlers was of military origin. The story of Jonathan, the high priest, and his three thousand soldiers coming to help Demetrius II Nicator against the Antiochenes in 145 B.C., is too well-known.[5] Krauss thinks that the Jews of Antioch were of Jonathan's party and that they provoked the burning of the city,[6] although we have not found a record of

---

[1] Supra, p. 42, n. 3; Krauss, op. cit., pp. 29-31; Le Talmud de Jerusalem, X, 61.

[2] Kraeling, op. cit., p. 134; Krauss, "Antioche," op. cit., p. 31.

[3] Josephus Jewish Wars vii. 3. 43 mentions the votive offerings of brass which were restored to them after the sack of the temple in 170 B.C.; in vii. 3. 45 he mentions offerings of gold. Le Talmud de Jerusalem, XI, 276 speaks of the rabbis going to the suburbs of Antioch to collect alms for learned men, and of Aba Juda who, after losing his fortune, sold half of his remaining field and then regained his fortune in oxen, asses, and camels. This was in the second century A.D.

[4] Malalas, p. 290 on buying the house of Asabinus, the magistrate, a Jew by profession (Ἀσαβίνου πολιτευομένου, Ἰουδαῖου τὴν θρησκείαν) to build the Plethrum, under Didius Julianus at the end of the second century A.D.

[5] Josephus Antiquities xiii. 5. 135-144.

[6] Krauss, "Antioche," op. cit., p. 34.

this. It is not impossible that in these frequent appeals of the last Seleucids to the high priests and their soldiers, some military elements remained in Antioch. In the early empire a Babylonian Jew, called Zamaris, came to Antioch with five hundred horsemen; he was settled in Oualatha (Ὀυαλάθα) near Antioch, to leave it shortly after, at the invitation of Herod.[1] We are informed that some Jews were farm laborers, by an incidental reference made by Libanius to the Jews who had been working on his estate for generations, and who were becoming self-asserting through the encouragement of the military patrons who were encouraging the farmers against their landlords.[2]

Although the statements of Josephus regarding the citizen rights of the Antiochene Jews have been disproved, as we said above,[3] yet it is evident that the Jewish population enjoyed religious and judicial privileges, and formed an autonomous community (πολιτία)[4] with a chief magistrate[5] and a tribunal[6]

---

[1]Josephus Antiquities xvii. 2. 24.

[2]Libanius Or. xlvii. 13; Pack, op. cit., p. 48.

[3]Supra, pp. 50 ff.; another piece of evidence disproving what Josephus maintains is the parallel of Alexandria where his statement on the citizen rights of Alexandrian Jews in Antiquities xix. 5. 280 has been disproved by the letter of Claudius to the City of Alexandria. Cf. Reinach, op. cit., pp. 113-144.

[4]Krauss, "Antioche," op. cit., p. 36, nn. 3-4 says the word אנטכיא occurs in the Midrash. Chrysostom Homilies Against the Jews 1. 3 uses the term πολιτεία : οἶδα ὅτι πολλοὶ αἰδοῦνται Ἰουδαίους καὶ σεμνὴν νομίζουσιν εἶναι τὴν ἐκείνων πολιτείαν.

[5]Josephus Jewish Wars vii. 3. 46 speaks of a certain Antiochus whose father was chief magistrate ἄρχων of the Jews in the city in 69 A.D.

[6]Le Talmud de Jérusalem, X, 254 mentions the tribunal in Antioch which should hear a certain case instead of bringing it to the judgment of a rabbi in Tiberias.

both of whom are mentioned in our sources. Josephus mentions the bronze tablets (χαλκᾶς δέλτους) in which these privileges were inscribed, and says that when the people of Antioch asked Titus to remove them, after having received a negative answer for their petition to expel the Jews, he refused.[1]

The Jews lived in more than one quarter and region in Antioch. Some of them lived in Daphne where they had a synagogue, and around the Daphnetic gate to the west.[2] Another group lived in the Holeth or alluvial plain to the northeast,[3] and a third group near the eastern gate which could have been the place referred to as the Cerateum (Κεραταῖον).[4] We have no basis for estimating the number of the Jewish population which Kraeling sets at a figure between forty-five and sixty-five thousand people by making some hazardous parallels.[5]

It would be interesting to know what was the attitude of kings, emperors, and citizens towards this Jewish community and if

---

[1]Josephus Jewish Wars vii. 5. 109.

[2]Chrysostom Homilies Against the Jews 1. 6 mentions the synagogue of Daphne. Descrizione araba, p. 149 mentions the church of Ashmunit on the mountain to the west, and says that it was a synagogue.

[3]Le Talmud de Jérusalem, II, 144 mentions the rice which grows there, in the חולת שבטירכיא . Kraeling, op. cit., p. 141 suggests that the Οὐαλάθα of the Babylonian Jew Zamaris could be identified with this Hulta or Holeth.

[4]Leclercq, op. cit., says that many early churches and sites of apostles were there and a grotto of St. Paul. Antioch-on-the-Orontes, II, 150 mentions an inscription, No. 24 with the letters ΓΟΛΒ found in the eastern side of Antioch, and above these letters is the drawing of a seven-branched candlestick; see Downey's suggestions on this inscription.

[5]Kraeling, op. cit., p. 135. He considered the proportion of their number to that of the total population about 12 percent, as in Egypt, and he considered the population of Antioch between three hundred thousand and half a million freedmen and citizens.

there was any racial or religious prejudice against its members. Josephus mentions the good treatment of Seleucid kings after Antiochus in spite of the fact that Epiphanes sacked the temple.[1] It is probably about this period, the middle of the second century B.C., that many of them settled in Antioch and Daphne.[2] Jewish rulers cooperated with Seleucid kings, as in the case of Jonathan helping Demetrius II against the people of Antioch; but this could not avoid the breeding of ill-feeling against the Antiochene Jews.

In the early imperial period, the Jewish community was prosperous; it began to attract multitudes of Greeks to its ceremonies, and one may suppose that some of its members were Hellenized.[3] The Roman emperors, as far as the records tell us, rarely interfered with the privileges of the Jews; in a few cases, they even defended them.[4] In other cases, they acted either as a result of general political conditions, or of the circumstances

---

[1]Josephus Jewish Wars vii. 3. 43.

[2]Babelon, op. cit., p. civ says that the new quarter of Epiphaneia was populated mostly by Jews who came after the sack of Jerusalem, became Hellenized and were attracted by Epiphanes. Krauss, "Antioche," op. cit., p. 29 explains the identification of Antioch with Hamath by the fact that, not only both are on the Orontes, but Hamath was called Epiphaneia and the new quarter of Antioch was called Epiphaneia; Riblah, being in the territory of Hamath (ii Kings 23:33) also had the same identification. On the other hand Krauss doubts that Epiphanes, who wanted to make Antioch a second Athens, was in favor of having a Jewish gola, and an orthodox one, in Antioch. We may suppose that he only admitted those elements who were more or less Hellenized.

[3]Josephus Jewish Wars vii. 3. 45; Kraeling, op. cit., p. 146.

[4]Josephus Antiquities xiv. 12. 323 for the letter of Mark Antony to Antioch and other cities to return to the Jews what had been taken from them. Ibid. xii. 3. 119 for Mucianus upholding the oil privilege. Josephus Jewish Wars vii. 5. 109 refusal of Titus to expel the Jews and remove the bronze tablets when the Antiochenes asked him to do so.

created by the triumph of Christianity in the fourth century.[1] In one instance at least, Josephus commends the attitude of the people of Antioch towards the Jews; this was in 66 A.D. when there was a general rising against them in Syria.[2] In another instance it was a certain Antiochus, son of the chief magistrate of the Jews in the city who provoked an uprising against his people.[3] We have in this incident the mention of troops helping him and obliging the Jews to work on the Sabbath. We do not know if this Antiochus is to be considered as a liberal trying to put an end to Jewish exclusiveness, for the method he chose was very prejudicial to his community.[4] In a few cases, the clashes started in the circus between the Blues and the Greens and were diverted by popular passion against the Jews, whether in the time of paganism or Christianity.[5] Under Caligula, there were troubles between

---

[1]The statement of Malalas, p. 279 on Vespasian building a theatre in Daphne on the site of a synagogue to insult the Jews, is rather doubtful. Krauss, "Antioche," op. cit., p. 38 says: "C'est le moine chrétien qui parle ici." Evagrius i. 13 mentions the incident of Immestar near Antioch in 415 where a Christian boy was supposed to have been crucified by Jews, so the synagogues of Antioch were taken by Christians; Theodosius II wanted to give the synagogues back a few years later, but the intervention of Symeon Stylites prevented him.

[2]Josephus Jewish Wars ii. 18. 479: "Only Antioch, Sidon, and Apamea spared the residents and refused to kill or imprison a single Jew by pity for men with no revolutionary intentions." Krauss, "Antioche," op. cit., p. 36 says because they were a small minority and there was no fear of them. Kraeling, op. cit., p. 150 attributes it to the influence of King Agrippa, and the strong hand of the Governor Gallus.

[3]Josephus Jewish Wars vii. 3. 46, 54 mentions two fires in the city which were really one and the same.

[4]Kraeling, op. cit., p. 151 holds the opinion that Antiochus must have seen in Jewish exclusiveness an obstacle to the achievement of a higher type of religion.

[5]Malalas, p. 244: In the third year of Caligula a fight began between Blues and Greens, then the Greeks clashed with the Jews; p. 389: under Zeno there was a riot of Blues and Greens; the passions were directed against the Jews who sided with the

pagans and Jews in Antioch and in Alexandria. Claudius sent a letter to Alexandria ordering the cessation of troubles, and he sent a copy of that letter to Antioch.[1] We do not know if Claudius ordered the Jews of Antioch to stop admitting other Jews from outside as he ordered those of Alexandria, nor do we know if he considered them as foreigners in Antioch as he considered them in Alexandria, when he told them "to be satisfied with enjoying their own revenues, and, inhabitants of a foreign city (ἐν ἀλλοτρίᾳ πόλει), to profit from the abundance of good things."[2]

When Christianity triumphed with Constantine, the Christians became persecutors instead of being persecuted. Theodoret criticizes the Emperor Julian for favoring the Jews and trying to build their temple.[3] He is indignant at the Arian Emperor Valens under whom the rites of the Jews and of others "are no longer performed in a corner" but openly.[4] The Homilies of Chrysostom against the Jews show that the Jewish community was still important enough to warrant such an attack, and that the synagogue was still attracting people. This continued importance could explain not only the attack of Chrysostom but the quarrels and riots that took place after the fourth century.[5] Chrysostom

---

Blues; p. 396: a synagogue was burned under Anastasius in Daphne during the celebration of the Olympic games.

[1]Reinach, op. cit., p. 118; Kraeling, op. cit., p. 149 says that the troubles were provoked by the fact that Claudius placed his statue in the Temple of Jerusalem.

[2]Reinach, op. cit., pp. 130-131.

[3]Theodoret iii. 15. On the question of Julian and the Temple of Jerusalem, see Ammianus xxiii. 1. 2.

[4]Theodoret iv. 21.

[5]Karalevskij, op. cit., says that Judaism did not cease making proselytes.

was especially furious that many Christians still go to the synagogue of Daphne and sleep there,[1] that they take oaths in the synagogue thinking they are more binding, or go to Jewish tribunals,[2] that they fast on Jewish fast days,[3] and celebrate Easter as Passover.[4] In another homily, Chrysostom refers to Christians who observe the same fasts with the Jews, keep the sabbaths, and frequent places consecrated by the Jews.[5] He attributes to the Jews sorceries and magic arts.[6]

Chrysostom, so vehement against the Jews, wrote a series of homilies honoring the Jewish martyrs known as the seven Maccabean brothers, their mother, and the old man Eliezer. Chrysostom honored them, however, as Christian martyrs,[7] and it seems that this is the only instance of a martyrdom revered both to Judaism and Christianity.[8] Severus of Antioch made of them and their mother "a picture of the church which has assembled the peoples, and which was formerly without children, but has received later a big posterity."[9] The Maccabean brothers and their mother Hashmonit, known also as Ashmunit[10] and in the Syriac calendar of

---

[1]Chrysostom Homilies Against the Jews i. 6.

[2]Ibid. i. 3. [3]Ibid. 1. 4. [4]Ibid. iii. 4.

[5]Chrysostom Homilies on Titus iii. 2.

[6]Chrysostom Homilies on St. Matthew xliii. 4.

[7]Chrysostom wrote three homilies known as Homilies on the Maccabeans; see the Patrologiae Graecae, ed. J. P. Migne (Paris, 1859), L, 617-628.

[8]Julian Oberman, "The Sepulchre of the Maccabean Martyrs," Journal of Biblical Literature, L (1931), 250.

[9]Severus of Antioch Homily lii حلا طمحنا in Patrologia Orientalis (referred to hereafter as P.Or), ed. R. Graffin and F. Nau (Paris, 1903-), IV, 7.

[10]Descrizione araba, p. 149.

martyrs as Shamuni (ܫܡܘܢܝ),[1] and the priest Eliezer were probably martyred at Antioch under Antiochus IV Epiphanes.[2] A sanctuary was built for them[3] and towards the middle of the fourth century, it seems that this sanctuary was converted to a church, and the cult of the martyrs was adopted by the Christians.[4] This conversion to a church was probably during the controversies of the fourth century.[5]

The Size of the Population of Antioch

Antioch was one of the most populous cities in the Hellenistic-Roman period. Constant building activity was going on, due not only to earthquakes, but to the increase and movement of population.[6] Libanius gives us a picture of every quarter seeming to swarm with people within and without the gates. "Full market time" (πληθούσης ἀγορᾶς), he says, "was meaningless

---

[1]Oberman, op. cit., p. 257.

[2]The story of their martyrdom is related in ii Maccabees 7: 1-42 without mentioning the place. Malalas, p. 207 mentions Epiphanes killing Eliezer and the Maccabeans in Antioch. Recent research has practically established their martyrdom in Antioch; see Oberman, op. cit., p. 252; Max Maas, "Die Maccabäer als christliche Heilige," Monatschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums, XLIV (1900), 150.

[3]Malalas, p. 207, under Demetrius (probably Demetrius I Soter), a certain Judah buried them in Antioch.

[4]Descrizione araba, p. 149 says that the church of Ashmunit was a synagogue. Leclercq, op. cit., says that the Syriac calendar of Edessa of 411 A.D., published by Wright mentions their feast on the first of August. He, therefore, places the adoption of the cult by the Christian church between 362 and 411.

[5]Maas, op. cit., p. 153.

[6]One of the problems of Antioch was the removal of rubbish from demolished houses and public buildings. Libanius in Or. 1. 2, 23, 24 criticizes the unfair usage of obliging the farmer to load his draft animals with rubbish on returning from the city.

because the market teemed at every hour of the day."[1] The Seleucid period left us no record of the number of population. The writer of the First Maccabees has left an indication of the large number of people in an exaggerated statement. Speaking of the revolt under Demetrius II Nicator, he says: "Those that were of the city gathered themselves into the midst of the city to the number of one hundred and twenty thousand and wanted to slay the king . . . he called the Jews for help and they slew one hundred thousand in the city."[2] If the number of insurgents, probably all adult males, was 120,000, one would have to multiply the number by three or four to include women and children, and to include the Jewish population who probably were not among the insurgents in that fight. Moreover, we can judge from the number of those who were slain that the statement is highly exaggerated, but it helps to give us an idea that the population was already great.

Coming to Roman times, we have a few indications on the number of inhabitants, yet these indications are not clear, for they do not say if the numbers they give include citizens only, or citizens and other free inhabitants, or if they include slaves, thus giving rise to all sorts of speculation and interpretations. Chrysostom gives us the first indication when he refers to Bishop Ignatius, at the end of the first century A.D., saying: "To have on one's hand so great a city and a population extending to two hundred thousand (Καὶ δῆμον εἰς εἴκοσιν ἐκτεινόμενον μυριάδας), of how great virtue and wisdom do you think there is a proof?"[3] This statement has been variously interpreted.

---

[1]Libanius Or. xi. 169 ff. Chrysostom Homilies on the Statues ii. 3 compares the population, flitting every day about the forum, to bees buzzing aroud their hive.

[2]1 Maccabees 11: 45-48.

[3]Chrysostom Homily on St. Ignatius 4.

Baur says that Chrysostom meant possibly the adults only.[1] Schultze on the other hand says that women, children, and slaves are not included in that number, and so he estimates the total population at 800,000.[2] Kraeling says that slaves, children and the suburbs were not included and so he concluded that the total number of free inhabitants was between 300,000 and half a million.[3] Beloch believes that Antioch must have had around 300,000 free inhabitants at the beginning of our era.[4] Studying the population of Apamea where the number of homines cives in the census of 6-7 A.D. was 117,000,[5] Cumont believes that only the citizens with their women and children were meant; and as the number of non-citizens was great because of the property qualification, the population of 117,000 citizens in Apamea territory must have attained 400,000 to half a million with non-citizens and slaves.[6]

To interpret Chrysostom's statement, we must know, in the first place, that it was made about three centuries after the time of Ignatius, and unless Chrysostom had some exact census in mind,

---

[1]Baur, op. cit., I, 29.

[2]Schultze, op. cit., p. 152.

[3]Kraeling, op. cit., p. 135.

[4]Julius Beloch, Die Bevölkerung der griechisch-römischen Welt (Leipzig, 1886), p. 245 says Apamea had 117,000 free inhabitants in 6-7 A.D., Alexandria had 300,000 free inhabitants; the slaves in it must have reached half a million; Seleuceia-on-the-Tigris had 600,000 inhabitants according to Pliny N.H. vi. 30. 122.

[5]This census made by the legate Quirinius and referred to in Luke 2:1, was mentioned in an epitaph found in Berytus where the population of Apamea is given.

[6]F. Cumont, "The Population of Syria," Journal of Roman Studies, XXIV (1934), 187-190 refers to Dio Chrysostom in Oration xxxiv. 4. 3 saying that in Tarsus which belonged to the Province of Syria until 73 A.D., the enrollment as citizen depended on the payment of 500 drachmae.

of which we do not know, the figure he gives must have been only a rough figure. In the second place, if Chrysostom was referring to an official census, we have no means of telling if that census included only the citizens, or all the free inhabitants; but in any event it would include the women and children, for the census is made for the purpose of taxation, and it is necessary to know the age of the residents and to register them all.[1] If, in the third place, Chrysostom was not quoting some official census, we have the impression that he was not interested in making a distinction between citizens and non-citizens, nor between adults and children, nor between men and women. He wanted simply to impress his hearers with the responsibility of Ignatius in his episcopacy over such a great city. So, we believe that all the interpretations tending to exclude children, or women, or non-citizens from this estimate, are irrelevant. The only element whom we can exclude is the slave population, and thus we will have to accept the figure of 200,000 inhabitants for the free population of Antioch at the end of the first century A.D., which makes it less populated than Rome, Alexandria, and Seleuceia-on-the-Tigris.[2] This of course would not include the inhabitants of the

---

[1] Comont, "The Population of Syria," op. cit., pp. 187-190. Even when there is an official census, the figure is differently interpreted as in the case of Apamea mentioned above, where Cumont says it refers to the citizens only, including women and children, while Beloch says it refers to all the free inhabitants.

[2] In the estimates for other cities, the slave population is not included as a rule. The estimates for the population of Rome are given by L. Friedländer, Roman Life and Manners under the Early Empire, trans. from 7th ed. of Sittengeschichte Roms by L. Magnus and others (4 vols.; London, 1908-1913), I, 17 who says it was possibly not less than a million; in the appendix on the population of Rome, IV, 17 he gives 675,000 free inhabitants in one estimate, and one million and a quarter in another, based on the consumption of corn; but it seems that many persons came from the suburbs of Rome to take corn and were included in the estimates. Beloch, op. cit., pp. 392 ff. speaks of 800,000 in 5 B.C., and says that the figure remained stationary until Diocletian's time.

suburbs and the region of Antioch. One could double that number to give the estimate of the entire population including the slaves who were very numerous.[1]

In the fourth century Libanius gives us in one of his epistles a statement which places the number of population at 150,000.[2] The same questions which were raised regarding Chrysostom's statement, could be raised here; but we can again say that Libanius wanted to tell his friend, after Julian had been insulted in Antioch, that the inhabitants of the city could not all be good; and we do not suppose that Libanius meant to exclude non-citizens or non-adults. This number, quite modest, makes us realize the exaggeration of those who made Chrysostom's estimate for the first century reach 300,000, especially since the fourth century was a period of great prosperity, and the population must have increased instead of decreasing in relation to the first century.

Another statement of Chrysostom, however, might suggest that the estimate of Libanius, given about a quarter of a century earlier, was a little too low. In one of his homilies he says: "For I suppose that by the grace of God those who assemble themselves here amount to the number of one hundred thousand."[3] The

---

[1]Chrysostom Homilies on I Corinthians xl. 6; Libanius Or. xxxi. 11; Or. xlvii. 28; supra, p. 59, n. 5.

[2]Libanius Epistle 1119. 3-4, in the year 363 A.D., writing to Nicocles and telling him: "You are not going to accuse all our city of wickedness," Libanius adds, "for I do not know if it is possible for a hundred and fifty thousand people all to be good" (πεντεκαίδεκα δὲ μυριάδας ἀνθρώπων πάντας εἶναι χρηστοὺς οὐκ οἶδα εἰ τῶν δυναντῶν .)

[3]Chrysostom Homilies on St. Matthew lxxxv. 4: καὶ γὰρ τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ χάριτι εἰς δέκα μυριάδων ἀριθμὸν οἶμαι τοὺς ἐνταῦθα συναγομένους τελεῖν.

question quickly arises, what did Chrysostom mean by "those who assemble themselves here"? Surely he did not mean those who assemble themselves in the church where he was preaching; and so there was no need for Schultze to say that it was a mistake in the text and an impossibility.[1] It has been suggested that he meant the sum of all the congregations of Antioch.[2] But what congregations? For there were many Arians and other smaller sects. Baur suggests the Catholic Christians,[3] and again he believes Chrysostom means the adults only.[4]

We believe that Chrysostom was simply giving an approximate number of the orthodox Christian population of his city, and we do not know on what basis the non-adults should be excluded, for they are a part of the community and they go to church; we have also to account for the fact that preachers are usually interested in exaggerating the number of their congregation. Thus if we add to the figure given by Chrysostom, the number of Arians, who were fairly numerous in Antioch,[5] and other Christian sects, the total number of Christians might reach 150,000 inhabitants.

---

[1]Schultze, op. cit., p. 151.

[2]Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, 1st series, ed. Philip Schaff (New York, 1888), X, 510, n. 1.

[3]He means possibly the orthodox, the two terms are interchangeably used to mean partisans of the official state church.

[4]Baur, op. cit., I, 29. Thus Baur says that with the Arians and other sects, and considering the Christians as a majority, the total figure, including children, would be between 300,000 and 500,000 including Jews and pagans.

[5]Emperors Constantius and Valens favored the Arians openly in Antioch, and the libels made against Jovian in 363 A.D. were ascribed partly to the Arians because he was orthodox; see John of Antioch in Excerpta Historica of Constantine Porphyrogenetes, II, Part I, 201.

With the Christians as a majority towards the end of the fourth century, the pagans and Jews might have been not less than 100,000. The total number of the free population would thus reach one quarter of a million, and with the slave population it would be half a million.

The figure given for the number of victims in the earthquake of 526 will give us an idea of the size of the population of the city and at the same time of the great differences in the evaluation of that population. Malalas says that the number of victims was 250,000.[1] Procopius, on the other hand, gives the high figure of 300,000.[2] Thus already we have a difference of 50,000 for the number of victims, who, if considered to be half of the population, would make a difference of 100,000 in the evaluation of the total population, and with with the understanding that both men lived in that period and were contemporary of the event. This is highly instructive for the other estimates. Also we should remember that the earthquake took place on Ascension Day when great multitudes had flocked into the city from the suburbs,[3] so the figures can bear only on the population of the whole region of Antioch.

---

[1] Malalas, p. 419.

[2] Procopius The History of the Wars ii. 14.

[3] Malalas, pp. 419 ff.

CHAPTER III

THE POPULATION OF ANTIOCH

THE PROBLEMS OF RACE, NATIONALITY, AND LANGUAGE

After the settlement of Aetolians, Cretans, and Euoboeans in the second century B.C., we have no record of a mass settlement of Greek elements in Antioch. The chroniclers and writers, and especially Libanius, anxious to register any influx of Hellenic population, would not have failed to point it out if it had occurred. We are then obliged to conclude that, with the exception of such casual settlement of individual immigrants and military elements of various origins under Seleucids and Romans as we have referred to, the important element that was being added constantly to the population by local emigration was the Semitic element from Syria, and we have no record of any law against its admission. Yet we know that the kernel of the population was Greek and that the city was organized theoretically on the model of a Greek city with magistrates, city council, and assembly of citizens.[1] We know too that from the very beginning of the foundation, a part of the population was granted citizen rights while a part was not.[2] We know likewise by drawing parallels from Seleuceia-in-Pieria[3]

---

[1] Supra, pp. 13 ff.

[2] Josephus C. Apion ii. 4. 39 speaks of Jewish residents called Antiochenes having been granted rights of citizenship by the founder Seleucus. This and the resulting discussion on the rights of citizenship for the Jews implies that from the start, citizen rights were a privilege reserved to a certain group.

[3] Seyrig, op. cit., p. 256; Welles, op. cit., p. 186 concerning the granting of citizenship to a friend of Seleucus IV in 186 B.C.

and Tarsus,[1] that the enjoyment of citizen rights continued to be a privilege under Seleucids and Romans reserved for those whom the kings wanted to honor, or for those who fulfilled certain conditions. The enjoyment of certain institutions of social life such as the gymnasium depended on citizenship.[2] Laws, whose equivalent for Antioch we do not possess, were made in Hellenistic cities regulating inheritance so as to keep land in the original Macedonian or Greek stock.[3] Others were made for regulating such questions as change of name, marriage, and other relations within or between the communities in a city.[4] In spite of all that, we are told that the Asiatic elements under the Seleucids had favorable treatment as resident aliens in Hellenistic cities, and that they were able to obtain citizenship when they adopted the culture of the Hellenes, although the kings could step in and supervise naturalization.[5] The Seleucid successors of Alexander seem to have followed the famous idea set forth by Isocrates in his Panegyricus in 380 B.C., which says: "The title Hellenes is rather

---

[1]F. Cumont, "The Population of Syria," op. cit, p. 188 refers to Dio Chrysostom Or. xxxiv. 4. 3 who says that enrollment as a citizen in Tarsus depended on the payment of 500 drachmae, the regime being aristocratic and timocratic in the cities.

[2]Reinach, op. cit., p. 118, the letter of Claudius tells the Jews of Alexandria not to mix in games organized by the gymnasiarch and cosmetes.

[3]F. Cumont, Fouilles de Doura-Europos 1922-1923 (Paris, 1926), p. 309, Parchment V on the law of inheritance ab intestato, designed to leave the land in the hands of the nearest males or to go back to the king. Cumont believes it was the copy of a law made at the time of foundation.

[4]Winter, op. cit., pp. 25 ff., for clauses of the gnomon of the idios logos of 150 A.D., where there is a clear indication that the Roman government wanted to keep the Romans and citizens of Alexandria separate from Egyptians, and even to keep the Romans separate from Greeks.

[5]Jouguet, op. cit., p. 375.

applied to those who share our culture than to those who share a common blood."[1] It was by this admission of the native to political life and by intermarriage between the different classes of natives and Graeco-Macedonians, that a mixed population was formed and the process of hellenization was carried out.[2] In Antioch, where the Graeco-Macedonian element was more numerous than elsewhere in the East, excepting Alexandria, marriages were common between Syrians and Greeks, and Antioch became one of the places where the one race was most intermingled with the other.[3]

Now it is our purpose to determine, in view of this great mixture of elements that entered into the composition of the Antiochene population, what was the race and nationality of that population, or what racial or national label, if any, was attached to them or they attached to themselves, and under what racial or national connotation were some of the leading men of Artioch known.

The Question of Race and Nationality

It would be interesting to know, in the first place, how the Seleucid kings and their kingdom were viewed, and what racial and national designations were given to them. On the one hand, tradition was wont to relate them to Heracles and to make them descendants of Apollo[4] in order to make them genuine Greeks. By

---

[1]Isocrates Panegyricus iv. 50 ed. and trans. George Norlin, Loeb Classical Library, I (London: W. Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1928), 148; reference is made in I, 149, n. C to an inscription found on the Gennadeion in Athens saying: "They are called Hellenes, who share our culture" ("Ἕλληνες καλοῦνται οἱ τῆς παιδεύσεως τῆς ἡμετέρας μετέχοντες).

[2]Jouguet, op. cit., p. 376.

[3]Renan, op. cit., p. 128.

[4]Libanius Or. xi. 91: the descendants of Heracles were related to Seleucus by their ancestor Temenus. Justin xv. 4. 3: the mother of Seleucus dreamt she united with Apollo and when Seleucus

origin, however, they were Macedonians, and their rule is called "Macedonian rule."[1] To some Orientals, their kingdom appeared as a Greek kingdom, and the Seleucid era represented the years of the Hellenes.[2] On the other hand, the most common designation given to the successors of Seleucus, especially after their loss of Asia Minor is, "kings of Syria,"[3] or the "family of Syrian kings."[4] In one instance Strabo speaks of the Seleucid kingdom in 142 B.C., as "the kingdom of the Syrians" or the "kingdom of Syria" (τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν Σύρων).[5] Yet the language of the house of Seleucus was Greek and the cultural tradition was Hellenic. Thus, while they were Macedonian by origin, Greek by language, and Hellenic in culture, the most common designation given to them was "kings of Syria," and their family was the "family of Syrian kings." This gives us some idea of the complicated problem with which we have to deal in speaking of the population of Antioch.

Let us try to see, in the first place, by what racial or national terms their contemporaries viewed the Antiochene population. One group of authorities looks on the Antiochenes as Greeks

---

was born he had an anchor traced on his thigh, symbol of the anchor engraved on the ring which Apollo gave to his mother when she was pregnant.

[1]Justin xxxvi. 1. 10. Macedonico imperio.

[2]Bikerman, op. cit., p. 5; Daniel 11:2 The Kingdom Yavan (יָוָן מַלְכוּת); 1 Maccabees 1:10; 6:2.

[3]Polyaenus Strategmata iv. 21: Epiphanes is spoken of as "king of Syria" (παρὰ Ἀντιόχου Συρίας βασιλέως); Livy xxxviii. 16, "kings of Syria." For a list of other sources speaking of them as "kings of Syria," see Bikerman, op. cit., p. 5, n. 1.

[4]Strabo xvi. 796 speaks of a certain Cybiosactes who had pretended that he belonged to the family of the Syrian kings.

[5]Strabo xvi. 752. Strabo's use of the genitive of possession is similar to his use of it when he speaks of "the plain of the Antiochenes" (xvi. 751), and "the fortress of the Apamean country" (xvi. 752).

or Hellenes. Malalas tells us in connection with the rebuilding of the council house at Antioch by Pompey, that he honored the Antiochenes, for they were descendants of the Athenians.[1] But he himself had told us that from the time the Argives came asking for Io "until this time" (which could be the time of one of his sources), the Antiochene Syrians made a remembrance at the same time every year, knocking at the houses of the Hellenes.[2] This passage presupposes a distinction of two races in the city, and contradicts the other statement on the Athenian descent of the population. Bevan infers from this second passage, that the populace in the cities was largely and mainly Aramean.[3] This could be true, but one cannot infer it from this passage. We have to admit either that Malalas is confused because he copies from different sources without comparing and arranging his material,[4] or that he was referring to descendants of Athenians in connection with the council house, because the citizens were Greeks, but this is impossible for already under Pompey the population was very mixed; or finally, that this is one of those cases, numerous as we shall see, in which the authors did not know in what terms to speak of the people of Antioch.

In the fourth century A.D., we find Libanius trying to impress his hearers and readers with the noble descent of the Antiochenes who united "the antiquity of the Argives, the good laws of the Cretans, the kingly origin of the Cyprians, and the descent

---

[1]Malalas, p. 211: ἐτίμησε δὲ αὐτούς, ὡς ἐκ γένους Ἀθηναίους ὄντας.

[2]Malalas, p. 29.

[3]Bevan, op. cit., I, 228.

[4]R. Förster, "Antiochia," op. cit., p. 109 for criticism of Malalas and contradictions in him; cf. Krumbacher, op. cit., p. 327.

from Heracles."[1] He speaks of the Hellenes "our ancestors" (τοὺς προγόνους),[2] and of the Seleucids "who with good luck built a Hellenic city in the midst of a barbarian land."[3] When he compares Antioch with other places, he always compares it with Greece and Athens. Yet certain other passages of Libanius clearly explain in what sense he spoke of Antioch as a Hellenic city, and of its people as Hellenes. When he spoke of the beauties of the Hellenes divided between two cities, Antioch and Athens, he made the reservation: "if indeed by language rather than by descent [or race] one is called Hellene" (εἰ δὴ τοῖς λόγοις μᾶλλον ἢ τῷ γένει τὸν Ἕλληνα κλητέον).[4] Thus, he seems to acknowledge that, if Antioch and the Antiochenes are Hellene, they are so by language and not by racial descent. This sense becomes the more evident when we see him call the Roman Emperor Julian a "Hellene, ruling over Hellenes."[5] One should not be surprised at the zeal of Libanius for calling his city and its inhabitants and its Emperor Julian "Hellenes," for he was not only a sophist living on Hellenic studies and furious at those who went to study Latin and Roman Law,[6] but he was a "pagan even to madness" as De La Bléterie puts it,[7] and Hellenism was the last hope of paganism, and vice versa, towards the end of that fourth century when Christianity was about to give them both the coup de grâce.[8] The

---

[1] Or. xi. 57.

[2] Or. xi. 63.

[3] Or. xi. 68.

[4] Or. xi. 184

[5] Libanius Or. xv. 25: πρῶτον μὲν Ἕλλην τις εἶ καὶ κρατεῖς Ἑλλήνων.

[6] Pack, op. cit., p. 67; Libanius Or. i. 234, 255.

[7] John Duncombe, Select Works of the Emperor Julian with the History of the Emperor Jovian from the French of the Abbé De La Bléterie (2 vols.; London, 1784), II, 269.

[8] Libanius Or. xlv. 11 addressing Theodosius, a Christian

sophists with their pagan temples holding fast to the gods, were doing so, not only by religious conviction but out of historical fidelity to the old heritage and enthusiasm for the old culture.[1]

It is in this perspective that we should likewise view the words of Julian telling the Antiochenes: "I thought before coming that we should regard one another with the greatest possible affection, since you are sons of Greeks (Ἑλλήνων παῖδας) and I myself, though my family is Thracian, am a Greek in my habits" (Ἕλληνα τοῖς ἐπιτηδεύμασιν).[2] When he became disaffected with the Antiochenes and wanted to explain their immorality, he considered them descendants of that Antiochus I who loved his father's wife.[3] So the testimony of Julian concerning the racial identity of the Antiochenes is confused by his calling them at one time sons of Greeks, at another descendants of Antiochus I, and on another occasion calling Antiochus I simply their founder.

Later on, in the fifth century, the Roman Empress Eudocia, wife of Theodosius II, an Athenian by extraction and daughter of a sophist, stops at Antioch on her way to Jerusalem, makes an oration in public, and closes her speech to the people by the address of Glaucus to Diomede in the Iliad[4] saying; "I boast that I am of

---

emperor, he swears "by Zeus," and says: "the gods know this, especially Helios." Pack, op. cit., says: "For Libanius, everything before and after Julian was night." Libanius was very much concerned when the emperor withdrew his support from the temples.

[1]Baur, op. cit., I, 257. [2]Julian Misopogon 367C.

[3]Ibid. 348B: "Then I have no right to be angry with his descendants (τοῖς δ'ἀπ'ἐκείνου γιγνομένοις) when they emulate their founder." This identification of the people of a Hellenistic city with its founder, racially or otherwise, Julian shows in addressing the Alexandrians telling them: "Men of Alexandria, you who have conquered the Egyptians, for your founder was the conqueror of Egypt," Letter 47, 433 B, year 362 A.D., in Works of Julian, III, 144.

[4]Homer Iliad vi. 211 ed. and trans. A. T. Murray, Loeb Classical Library, I (London: W. Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1924).

your stock and blood" (Τμετέρης γενῆς τε καὶ αἵματος ἔὔχομαι εἶναι).[1] Eudocia was undoubtedly referring to the early Greek founders of Antioch as related in the stories of foundation mentioned above. She was one of those who favored the classical revival among the Christians at court, and a great enthusiast for Hellenism. Evidently she was thinking of the cultural milieu and the Hellenic tradition portrayed by Libanius, and we doubt if she actually meant that the Antiochenes of her time were Greeks by blood.

Another group of authorities, on the other hand, spoke of the Antiochenes as Syrians. Pausanias in the second century A.D., referring to Eutychides the sculptor, says: "He made for the Syrians on the Orontes an image of Fortune" (Καὶ Σύροις τοῖς ἐπὶ Ὀρόντῃ τύχης ἐποίησεν ἄγαλμα).[2] About half a century later, Herodian says: "The Syrians are by nature lovers of feasts and especially those of them who live in Antioch"(ὧν μάλιστα δὲ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν κατοικοῦντες).[3] According to the same Herodian, the Emperor Septimius Severus spoke to his Illyrian soldiers on his way to Syria to fight his rival Niger, saying: "The Syrians are people apt to poke fun at others and compose satires, and especially those who live in Antioch."[4] Malalas himself has other passages than those we have already mentioned, in which he refers to the Antiochenes as Syrians. Referring to the first regular Olympic Games under Commodus,

---

[1]Evagrius i. 20.

[2]Pausanias Description of Greece vi. 2. 7. He refers to them again as "the Syrians who live on the Orontes river."

[3]Herodian ii. 7. 9.

[4]Ibid. ii. 10. 6.

he says: "They were celebrated by the Antiochene Syrians" (τοῖς Ἀντιοχεῦσι Σύροις).[1]

We do not know what Juvenal, living away in Rome at the end of the first century A.D. meant the Syrian Orontes to be, when he spoke of it "pouring since long into the Tiber, bringing its language and manners and flutes."[2] Did he mean Antioch or Syria in general? and if he meant Antioch, did he mean it as a real Syrian city or as a part of that Greek world which was invading Rome with its language and manners? For, if we look at the context, we find that it begins by saying that Rome has become a Rome of Greeks, that the Greeks were the race most dear to the rich men of Rome, and that a big fraction of the dregs in Rome came from Greece.[3] Then abruptly he mentions the Syrian Orontes (iii. 62-65), and goes back again[4] to speak of clowns from different places in Greece. We believe that in the imagination of the satirist, Antioch-on-the-Orontes was a Greek city, and those of its inhabitants who went to Rome were included in that Greek mass of whom he was complaining.

Another testimony concerning the Antiochenes given by Apollonius of Tyana in the first century A.D., or by Philostratus his biographer at the end of the second, who put the words in his mouth, speaks of the people of Antioch as "half barbarous and uncultivated,"[5] taking "no interest in any affairs of the

---

[1]Malalas, p. 286.

[2]Juvenal Satires iii. 62-65 ed. and trans. G. G. Ramsay, Loeb Classical Library (London: W. Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1928).

[3]Ibid. iii. 58-61. [4]Ibid. iii. 66 ff.

[5]Philostratus Life of Apollonius i. 16: "When Apollonius beheld the temple of Apollo in Daphne so graceful and yet the home of no serious studies but only of men half barbarous and uncultivated . . ." (ἀνθρώπους ἡμιβαρβάρους καὶ ἀμούσους).

Hellenes,"[1] and even of the Ladon, river of Daphne, "becoming a barbarian after being a Hellene and an Arcadian."[2] The testimony bears essentially on the cultural aspect of the population in the first two centuries A.D., and is in line with the general sophistic movement of that age interested in the religious and literary revival of antique forms of Hellenism.[3] Yet it conveys a picture of the change in the population which became barbarian after it had been Hellene, if we take the river of Daphne to symbolize the inhabitants of that region. Philostratus might have also meant that the people of Antioch were Syrians when he says: "The Assyrians[4] attach the legend of Arcadia to Daphne, daughter of Ladon, and the river is called Ladon."[5]

Livy already at the end of the first century B.C. had spoken of that mixture when he placed that famous speech on the lips of Manlius to his soldiers in 189 B.C. to prove that the peoples they were going to fight in Asia had become degenerates of mixed race, and having been transplanted to another soil, they had lost their virtue. "The Macedonians," says Livy, "who hold Alexandria in Egypt, and Syria and Parthia have degenerated to Syrians, Parthians, Egyptians. . . ."[6] It is not our intention

---

[1] Ibid. iii. 58.

[2] Ibid. i. 16: βάρβαρος ἐξ Ἕλληνός τε καὶ Ἀρκάδος.

[3] Philostratus Life of Apollonius, ed. Loeb, I, xix.

[4] The Syrians were often spoken of as "Assyrians" by ancient authors. Lucian Syrian Goddess 17: "Stratonice wife of the king of the Assyrians"; Justin i. 2. 13: "The Assyrians who were called Syrians."

[5] Philostratus Life of Apollonius i. 16.

[6] Livy xxxviii. 17 ed. and trans. B. O. Foster, Loeb Classical Library (London: W. Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1919-).

to go into that question of degeneration by the admixture of the blood of other races, nor into the question of what races were inferior and which ones were superior,[1] but it is worth noting that neither Livy considers the Macedonians as still remaining Macedonians, nor do Apollonius and Philostratus seem to consider the population of Antioch as remaining Hellenic.

Thus, from the testimony of different writers we cannot obtain a clear racial picture of the Antiochene population, nor is there unanimity as to what the Antiochenes were. Some call them Greeks and Hellenes, others Syrians, and still others half barbarians and degenerates of mixed race. Those who called them Hellenes were right in so far as the old kernel of the population was Hellenic including Greeks and Macedonians, and in so far as the cultural tradition including language is concerned, and, in general, in the sense in which Isocrates wanted the term Hellene to be understood. Those who called them Syrians were right not only on account of the geographic environment and from a geographic point of view, but because the number of Syrians speaking the Syrian language[2] was an actual reality. As for those who considered them half barbarians they were right, because at the time they

---

[1] Renan, op. cit., p. 128 after mentioning the mixture of races in Antioch says: "The degradation of the people was terrible." F. Cumont, Les religions orientales dans le paganisme romain (4th ed.; Paris, 1929), p. 1 criticizes Renan and shows that the Orientals were not responsible for the decomposition of the ancient world. Mommsen, op. cit., II, 132 agrees with Apollonius in his description of the Antiochenes, yet he had said (p. 112) that Antioch and Alexandria were the true pillars of Hellenic development, while the Greek domain had vanished in Europe and Africa in the presence of the compact mass of the Latin domain. Rostovtzeff, The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire, p. 485 criticizes Tenny Frank's theory of degeneration by the admixture of the blood of inferior races and does not agree to the consideration of the Greek and Latin races as the only superior ones in the Roman Empire.

[2] We shall speak later in this chapter of the question of language.

wrote, the population was a great mixture in race and culture and could no more be considered Graeco-Macedonian.

This being the testimony of others on the Antiochenes in general, let us see now what some representative Antiochenes thought they were and if they attributed to themselves any special racial or national identity. All the testimonies we have are from the fourth century onwards, but we will have occasion to go for parallels to earlier centuries from other cities in Syria.

We are already familiar with Libanius who boasts of the Greek descent of the Antiochenes on the one hand, and on the other hand makes a significant reservation when he speaks of Antioch sharing with Athens the beauties of the Hellenes, by saying: "if indeed by language rather than by descent one is called Hellene." This is not all that Libanius has to say concerning himself and his people. In a few passages, he calls himself a Syrian, and in one of them he even says: "We, Syrians, boast of furnishing excellent men to the Romans to order the affairs of cities."[1] In the other passage, he thinks it a betrayal to be silent, being a Syrian and perhaps able to say something about an affair in which the Syrians are attacked.[2] In one instance at least he seems to be a cosmopolitan: "I have considered the things of the whole universe mine, good and bad, and I have become such as the fortunes of the world make me, not deserving to be hated for loving the

---

[1]Libanius Epistle 391 to Anatolius in 355 A.D.: Καὶ μεγαλαύχουμεθα γὰρ Σύροι Ῥωμαίοις παρέχοντες ἄνδρα δεινὸν κοσμῆσαι πόλεων πράγματα.

[2]Libanius Or. lxiv. 9: Ἔδοξέ μοι προδοσία τις εἶναι Σύρον ὄντα καὶ αὐτὸν καὶ λέγειν ἴσως δυνάμενον σιγῆσαι.

world."[1] When, elsewhere, he calls himself Phoenician,[2] it might be an instance in which the terms Syrian and Phoenician are interchangeable.[3] We do not know the racial structure of his family, but we know from others that he is called a Syrian sophist[4] and that he comes from a leading family in the city.[5] Thus Libanius feels himself Hellene and Syrian with a cosmopolitan tendency at times.[6]

Ammianus Marcellinus, who was an Antiochene and a contemporary of Libanius, distinctly speaks of himself as a Greek. When he is about to finish his historical work, he says: "These events . . . a former soldier and a Greek have set forth to the measure of my ability" (Haec et miles quondam et graecus...).[7] We do not know in what sense he was a Greek, and if he meant the racial descent or the question of culture and language. At times, he tried to identify himself with Roman outlook and character,[8] and speaks as a Roman citizen saying: "We acquired the dryer part of Libya."[9] He even wrote his history in Latin which he did not

---

[1]Libanius Or. ii. 65.

[2]Libanius Epistle 1049: "You make me the Phoenician always wishing to do good" (ποιεῖς δ'ἐμὲ τὸν φοινίκα τὸν πάνυ δη βουλόμενον εὖ πράττειν).

[3]Eunapius The Lives pp. 352, 354. Tyre is spoken of, first as capital of the Phoenicians, then as a Syrian town.

[4]Sozomen The Ecclesiastical History viii. 2 in Vol. LXVII of the Patrologiae Graecae: Λιβάνιος ὁ Σύρος σοφιστής.

[5]Eunapius, op. cit., p. 518.

[6]W. Christ, W. Schmid, and O. Stählin, Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur, Vol. II, Part II (6th ed.; München, 1924), 996.

[7]Ammianus xxxi. 16. 9.

[8]E. A. Thompson, The Historical Work of Ammianus Marcellinus (Cambridge, 1947), p. 16.

[9]Ammianus xxii. 16. 24.

master, for he uses Greek words often to make his meaning clear, and he puts certain Greek words into Latin characters.[1]

As for John, surnamed Chrysostom, who lived in Antioch in the second half of the fourth century, he has left us nothing about his parentage, not even the name of his parents. Palladius tells us that he was by birth a man of Antioch, the son of honorable parents, his father holding the office of military commander in Syria (magister militum).[2] Socrates mentions the name of his father Secundus and of his mother Anthusa,[3] and Baur concludes from his father's name and command that he was of Latin descent; as for speaking of his mother as a Greek of pure race (eine rein rassige griechin),[4] we do not know where Baur got his information, for he gives no references. The fact is that Chrysostom had a Greek education, and it seems that he wrote the best Greek written by a church writer, and he never understood any language except Greek.[5] Sozomen tells us that, when Libanius was on his death-bed he was asked by his friends who should take his place, "It would have been John," he is reported to have said, "had not the Christians stolen him."[6] Willamowitz-Möllendorf calls him a pure Atticist and a Christian Syrian.[7] Yet with all his learning in pagan Greek

---

[1]Thompson, op. cit., p. 17, n. 1 for a list of these words.

[2]The Dialogue of Palladius Concerning the Life of Chrysostom, ed. and trans. Herbert Moore (London, 1921), p. 37.

[3]Socrates Scholasticus The Ecclesiastical History vi. 3 in Vol. LXVII of the Patrologiae Graecae (referred to hereafter as P.G.).

[4]Baur, op. cit., I, 1-2. [5]Ibid., p. 252.

[6]Sozomen viii. 2: λέγεται Ἰωάννην εἰπεῖν εἰ μὴ Χριστιανοὶ τοῦτον ἐσύλησαν. Cf. A. Naegele, Chrysostomus und Libanios (Rome, 1908), pp. 50-59 for a discussion of this passage of Sozomen and how the careful λέγεται εἰπεῖν became more affirmative ἔλεγον in Theophanes in the eighth century and ἔφη with Cedrenus in the eleventh.

[7]Baur, op. cit., I, 252.

literature, Chrysostom, as a Christian father, was not proud of it. He mocked at the Greeks and their philosophers and sophists because they made themselves exponents of paganism.[1] Thus we should not expect him to boast either of Greek ancestry, or of Hellenic education and culture. He does not give us any testimony about himself having a racial or national connotation. He is first and foremost a Christian.

In the early fifth century, Theodoret, born of Antiochene parents, gives a testimony concerning his un-Greek and possibly Aramaic descent when he speaks of the Greek language as one "which, in a way, I share" (ἧς ἁμηγέπη μετέλαχον).[2] He recognizes his Greek education and that he spoke Greek, yet one can see that he did not feel as a Greek. Valesius speaks of him and of Evagrius, who was born at Epiphaneia (Hamath) in the sixth century but lived in Antioch, as Syrian by nationality.[3]

In the early sixth century, Severus the Monophysite bishop of Antioch refers to Isaiah 9:23 and says: "The prophet calls us Assyrians (ܐܬܘܪܝܐ), we who are placed towards the sunrise and in the Orient."[4] Thus he considers himself a Syrian, yet his homilies were in Greek and his education must have been Greek.[5]

---

[1]Chrysostom Homilies on the Statues xix. 3 where he makes fun of the philosophers. Homilies on I Corinthians iv. 7 he shows that Socrates drinking the hemlock does not compare in fortitude to the Christians who endured their body cut in pieces member by member.

[2]Theodoret Graecorum Affectionum Curatio in P.G., LXXXIII, 951: "I have not the least intention of disparaging the Greek language which, in a way, I share, or of making an ungrateful return to it for my education."

[3]The History of the Church until 594, p. 397.

[4]Severus of Antioch Homily xciii. in P.OR, XXV, 48.

[5]Rubens Duval in P.Or, IV, 5 on the homilies of Severus being lost in the Greek original and preserved in the Syriac version of Paul of Callinicus and Jacob of Edessa.

As for the chronicler John Malalas who lived in the sixth century and is known sometimes as John of Antioch,[1] we have no information on him except such as may be derived from his Graecized Syriac name which means "rhetor" or "preacher."[2] One thing is significant and noticeable throughout his entire Chronicle; he does not seem to boast of the Greek ancestry of Antioch, and while relating the legends about the early Greek colonists, which he must have taken from his sources or from oral tradition, he never uses the possessive "our ancestors" as Libanius does. Krumbacher calls him a "Graecized Syrian,"[3] and he must have known enough Greek to write his chronicle.

Thus the instances we have mentioned, which relate to representative persons of the educated class of Antiochenes, show that there is no definite racial or national Greek connotation attached to them. Some of them seem to be highly influenced by Hellenic education and culture, while others, as we come down to the fifth and sixth centuries, are more definitely Syrian and show signs of familiarity with the Syriac tongue, but their education is still Greek, and in either case there is no definite feeling of race or nationality.

If we study a few other cases of distinguished persons from different Syrian cities, we notice the same lack of anything

---

[1]Not to be confused with another John of Antioch who lived in that same century and wrote a universal history preserved partly in the Excerpta Historica of Constantine; cf. Krumbacher, op. cit., p. 334.

[2]From the Syriac ܡܠܠ in the nominal form ܡܰܠܳܠ which means "endowed with power of speech," "eloquent," "rhetor," hence the Greek form Μαλάλας. It could derive also from the participle adjective of the Peal form, which is ܡܰܠܶܠ and means "endowed with speech and reason."

[3]Krumbacher, op. cit., p. 325: gräzisierte Syrer.

definite in the testimonies. Poseidonius of Apamea who lived in the first century B.C., is mentioned often by Strabo; but regarding his origin and his race he does not say more than that he was a native of Apamea.[1] Sometimes he is referred to as the "Rhodian" from the place where he taught.[2] In that same century we have the interesting person of Meleager of Gadara. His epigrams are significant and help throw some light on this question of race and nationality. In one of them he says that Gadara is his first country (πάτρα), then sacred Tyre brought him to manhood, then the island of Cos made him one of her citizens and cared for his declining years.[3] In another epigram he says: "Island Tyre was my nurse, and Gadara which is Attic but lies in Syria gave birth to me"; then he adds: "If I am a Syrian, what wonder? (εἰ δὲ Σύρος, τί τὸ θαῦμα;) stranger, we dwell in one country, the world."[4] It is evident that Meleager recognizes that he is a Syrian, and speaks with certain emotion of the places where he was born and reared, yet he has the cosmopolitan tendency shared by the educated men of those days, and does not seem to be willing to attach to himself the strict label of any one country; his country is the world. His native town was a great center of Hellenism, and for that he describes it as Attic, although he realizes that it is in Syria. In him as later in Libanius, there is the feeling of belonging to a native town and to a certain geographic environment, mixed with the feeling of belonging to a

---

[1]Strabo xvi. 753: "Poseidonius the stoic, the most learned of all philosophers of my time was a native of Apamea."

[2]C. P. Mason, "Poseidonius," Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology, ed. W. Smith, Vol. III (1890).

[3]Greek Anthology vii. 418.

[4]Ibid. vii. 17. 1-2, 5-6.

world dominated by Greek culture.

The other instance we have chosen is that of Lucian of Samosata who lived in the second century A.D. From his different writings, one can hardly decide if he considered himself Syrian or Greek. In the Syrian Goddess he speaks of himself performing the rite of cutting a lock of his hair, putting it in a box, and leaving it in the Temple of Hierapolis.[1] This could reflect on his Syrian origin. In another instance he tells us that when "Rhetoric" (symbolizing Greek education) found him, he was still speaking his native accent (βάρβαρον ἔτι τὴν φωνήν) and might have exhibited himself in the garb of an Assyrian. Then he adds: "She educated me, made a Greek of me" (καὶ ἐς τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἐνέγραψε).[2] In two other instances he says that he is a Syrian,[3] but the comment he makes in the second is significant; he is addressing "Philosophy" and says:

> I am a Syrian, Philosophy, from the banks of the Euphrates, (Σύρος, ὦ φιλοσοφία τῶν ἐπ' Εὐφράτου) and some of my opponents are as foreign born as myself, but it makes no difference for you, even if a man's speech is foreign, if only his way of thinking were manifestly right and just.[4]

Thus Lucian knows that he is a Syrian, and his Praise of the Fatherland[5] shows a deep attachment to his native town, yet the feeling of Greek education is as strong as the feeling of belonging to a race or a country; in fact it makes him speak of

---

[1] Lucian Syrian Goddess 60.

[2] Lucian Double Indictment 27, 30.

[3] One of these two instances is in: The Ignorant Book Collector 19: κἀμὲ Σύρον ὄντα.

[4] Lucian The Fisherman 19.

[5] Lucian Works, ed. Jacobitz, III, 202 ff. πατρίδος ἐγκώμιον.

himself sometimes as a Greek.[1] This is the reason why some modern biographers call him Syrian, others call him Greek, and still others call him a Greek writer but of Syrian parentage.[2]

Thus the literary testimonies do not give us a definite idea of what the Antiochenes really were; they speak of them as Syrians or as Greeks depending upon the angle from which they view them. This is not surprising, especially when we see that one and the same person, whether he is a Meleager or a Lucian or a Libanius, is at a loss to determine what he himself is, Syrian or Greek or cosmopolitan. The writer of the gospel according to Mark, likewise was at a loss to define the race and nationality of the woman who came to Jesus near the borders of Tyre and Sidon, and he expresses her identity in these terms: "The woman was a Greek, a Syro-Phoenician by nation"[3] (ἡ δὲ γυνὴ ἦν Ἑλληνὶς Συροφοινίκισσα τῷ γένει),[4] which is not clear, and has given rise to different interpretations.[5] Evidently those who shared the Greek culture and were called Greeks or Hellenes

---

[1]Lucian Salaried Posts in Great Houses 40.

[2]The Works of Lucian, trans. H. W. Fowler and F. G. Fowler (4 vols.; Oxford, 1905), I, viii: "He was a Syrian." A. W. Mair, "Lucian," Encyclopaedia Britannica, 14th ed., Vol. XIV (1929): "He was a Greek sophist and satirist." Theodore Dyer, "Lucian," Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology, ed. W. Smith, Vol. II (1890): "He was a Greek writer but of Syrian parentage."

[3]New Testament, King James version, Mark 8:26; note 2 adds: "or gentile" instead of "Greek."

[4]Mark 8:26 in the Greek New Testament, ed. Eb. Nestle (16th ed.; New York, 1936).

[5]Walter Otto, "Hellenen und Barbaren aus der Geschichte des nationalbewusstseins," Philologische Wochenschrift, XLVI (1926), 41 believes that the word Ἑλληνὶς should not be rendered by "pagan." He explains the case of the woman as being of that class of Greek citizens who by their γένος are from Syria or Phoenicia, meaning probably Syrians obtaining the citizen rights of the Greeks.

without being Greeks by race, were in the same case as those writers under the Caliphate of Bagdad, who were referred to as Arabs without being actually Arabs by race.[1] Likewise those of the Antiochenes who without being of the educated class, were the product of a mixture of elements and racial groups, could be called or they could call themselves Hellenes, in the same way as the "renegades"[2] of Spain under Arab rule could call themselves Arabs and boast of their ancestors from Arabia or Syria, even though they had a good deal of Spanish blood in their veins.[3]

The literary testimonies fail to tell us also about the racial groups within the population of Antioch in the way in which Strabo and Josephus have told us something concerning the population of Alexandria and Seleuceia-on-the-Tigris respectively. The statement of Strabo is significant because it shows not only the consciousness of racial division within the city of Alexandria noticed by Polybius, but it enumerates the different elements, their qualities, and the mixture of the third class which was probably the class of citizens that was supposed to be of Greek origin.[4] As for the statement of Josephus, it is important

---

[1]DeLacy O'Leary, Arabic Thought and Its Place in History (London, 1939), p. 1.

[2]The Muwalladūn were called "renegades," but the term meant the non-Arabs of Spain whose parents embraced Islam and were brought up in an Arab tradition; cf. E. Lévi-Provençal, L'Espagne musulmane au dixième siècle (Paris, 1932), p. 19.

[3]Lévi-Provençal, op. cit., p. 19: "Les Arabes d'Espagne qui tiraient aux siècles suivants le plus grand orgueil de leurs ancêtres d'Arabie ou de Syrie avaient tous dans leurs veines une bonne part de sang espagnol."

[4]Strabo xvii. 797 quoting Polybius, who visited Alexandria and was disgusted with the state of things, says that there were three classes or races γένη inhabiting Alexandria: the Egyptian or native stock of people, quick tempered and not inclined to civic life; the mercenary class, severe, numerous, and intractable; and the race of the Alexandrians(γένος τὸ τῶν

because it enumerates the elements of the population of Seleuceia-on-the-Tigris and, what is important, their relations with each other and their quarrels,[1] which our sources for Antioch do not mention except in what relates to the Jewish community. Neither in the second century B.C., in which Polybius wrote, nor in the first century before and after Christ in which Strabo and Josephus respectively wrote, nor in later centuries do we have any reference to a differentiation between Syrians and Greeks within the population of Antioch and to quarrels between them as separate racial groups.[2] Writers seem to refer to them all, as we have shown previously, either as Syrians or as Greeks, with no reference to a part of the population which is native Syrian, and to another which is Greek. Time might reveal such testimonies, but for the moment we are inclined to think that the situation in Antioch was different from that of Alexandria and Seleuceia-on-the-Tigris, and that at a certain time in the history of Antioch, possibly not as early as the second century B.C., in which

---

Ἀλεξανδρέων) who also were not distinctly inclined to civic life and for the same reasons, but still they were better than those others, for even though they were a mixed people, still they were Greek by origin and mindful of the customs common to the Greeks.

[1]Josephus Antiquities xviii. 9. 374 speaks of the population of Seleuceia composed of more Greeks than Macedonians and not a few Syrians, of the quarrels between Greeks and Syrians in which the Syrians were badly treated until the Jews came and helped them; but the Greeks prevented their union and finally united with the Syrians by hatred to the Jews. The statement might be of an apologetic nature; but, taken altogether, it shows that there was at least, with Josephus, a knowledge of different racial groups conscious of their differences in Seleuceia, which he himself does not seem to recognize in relation to Antioch. He speaks of the Antiochenes as a whole, when he relates their treatment of the Jews in the city.

[2]For the possible confusion in the statement of Malalas where there is mention of Syrians knocking at the doors of Greeks see supra, pp. 45, 78.

Polybius wrote, the elements were so mixed that the population could not be spoken of any more in terms of racial groups but could be spoken of as a whole either as Syrians or Greeks depending on the angle from which they are viewed.

Leaving the literary testimonies and reserving, for the moment, our opinion on this whole question of race and nationality of the Antiochenes, we should like now to see if the study of names of persons found in Antioch could help throw some light on the question of race, and acquaint us with the relative proportion of racial groups and elements of population within the city.

The Personal Names of the Antiochenes

We are aware of the fact that names are often deceiving in the study of racial elements and are not always evidence of nationality, especially in these Hellenistic cities where much intermarriage took place and where the descendants of mixed parents were likely to be given Hellenic names to mark the Hellenic origin on the father's or the mother's side.[1] In some cases, likewise, we have an apparent Greek name, which is in reality the translation of a Semitic name, as in the well known case of Porphyry the neo-platonist, whose name in Tyre, as he himself testifies, was Malchus.[2] Still in other cases, frequent in Roman

---

[1]Cumont, Fouilles, p. 343 for his observation on this point in what relates to Doura-Europos. A. Tcherikover, The Jews in Egypt in the Hellenistic-Roman Age in the Light of the Papyri (Jerusalem, 1945), pp. 2, 28-31 on the question of the names of the Jews in Egypt and the indications of ethnic origin.

[2]Diogène de Laerte, Vies et doctrines des philosophes de l'antiquité suivies de la vie de Plotin par Porphyre, trans. M. Charles Zevort (Paris, 1847), II, 332 Porphyry says: "In the language of my native land I was called Malchus as my father . . . that is why Longinus, dedicating a work to Cleodamus and to me expresses himself thus, 'Cleodamus and Malchus.'" It is evident that Eunapius in his Lives, p. 354 has therefore made an error when he said that Longinus changed his pupil's name to Porphyry, for here he calls him Malchus.

times, the name is changed when the person is accorded the rights of citizenship especially in the case of veterans.[1] In the Christian church we have likewise changes of names among ecclesiastics; Philoxenus, the metropolitan of Hierapolis-Mambij in the sixth century, for example, was a Semite by birth, and his name was Aksenaya.[2] Sometimes the name is changed by the state, as in the case of that of Anu-Uballit of Uruk-Warqa to whom Antiochus II gave the other name Nikarchus,[3] and when it is not followed by the original Semitic name, it might be very misleading. There is also the frequent case where a native, purely and simply, takes a Greek name.

We are aware, likewise, that if such a study is to be fruitful, the documents bearing the names should be dated so that one could follow the evolution of the racial groups and the degree of their mixture in different periods.[4] The names should be also fairly abundant and well distributed on the periods of time which one is attempting to study. One should be able to know also where and on what material the names were found, in order to tell to what class of people they belong and hence, whether that particular racial group whom the name represents is limited to the

---

[1]Winter, op. cit., p. 24.

[2]Godefroy Goossens, Hiérapolis de Syrie (Louvain, 1943), p. 105.

[3]M. Rutten, Contrats de l'époque seleucide, Vol. XV of Babyloniaca (Paris, 1935), 70; R. A. Bowman, "Anu-Uballit--Kefalon," American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures, LVI (1939), 231.

[4]Cumont, Fouilles, pp. 341 ff. explains, for example, how in Parchment I of 195 B.C. found at Doura, all the names were purely Greek, and they remained predominant until the middle of the first century A.D. Later in the third century A.D., in Parchment VII, there were only two or three Greek names on twenty-three names in a list of taxpayers.

common people or has penetrated the upper classes of society.[1]

It is unfortunate that the inscriptions in which the names from Antioch were found are very fragmentary, mostly undated, and none go back to the Seleucid period.[2] The history of the Seleucid period has kept for us the names of three kings with Aramaic nicknames: Alexander Balas[3] 150-145 B.C., Demetrius II Siripides[4] 146-125 B.C., and Alexander II Zabinas[5] 128-123 B.C. The nickname Balas could have been given to the king by the people of Syria and possibly by those of Antioch.[6] As for Zabinas, it is a well known fact that he was the son of a merchant in Egypt called Protarcus, and that he was sent by Ptolemy VIII to wrest the kingdom from

---

[1]Cumont, Fouilles, p. 343 has found Semitic names in Doura in the third century A.D., not only on graffiti but on stone seats reserved for women of the notables in the Temple of Artemis, thus inferring that Semitic names had penetrated the aristocracy.

[2]The inscriptions are published in Antioch-on-the-Orontes (hereafter referred to as AOR), I, 52-53 by G. W. Elderkin; II, 148-164 by G. Downey; III, 83-114 by G. Downey.

[3]Bevan, op. cit., II, Appendix Z, 305-306 explains these names. Balas is a name formed with בעל , and as a compound name the termination a or as was substituted for the second part, in the same way as modern compound Arabic names with Allah in the second part substitute it by o, thus instead of saying Fadl-Allah (The Bounty of God) they say Fadlo, and similarly ʿAbdo for ʿAbd-Allah.

[4]Ibid. Bevan cannot find a derivation or explanation for Siripides. A derivation from שִׁיר meaning "chain" has been suggested, but one would not know where to place the P of Siripides. Professor Marcus has kindly called the writer's attention to a possible derivation from סָפַד "to swallow" or "block up" and the pael סִפֵּד "to swallow greedily."

[5]Ibid. Bevan suggests its being a well-known Aramaic name meaning "bought from the deity." In any event it derives from זָבַן to buy, and is probably the passive participle זְבִינָא "the bought one," rather than the noun זִבְנָא "sale" or "merchandise."

[6]Bevan, op. cit., II, 213 refers to Schürer who believes it was his original name, but Bevan believes that Alexander was known among the people as Balas.

Demetrius II.[1] He was installed as King Alexander, and evidently, the witty people of Antioch added the nickname Zabinas either referring to his descent from a commercial class, or to his being installed by the Ptolemies as if he were sold to them or bought by them. In any case, these nicknames indicate that at least a part of the population of Antioch in the second century B.C., consisted of Arameans and that Aramaic was used in everyday speech by a part of the population.

Coming to the names found in Antioch, we have noticed that all those which can be dated are from the Roman period. We have among one hundred and seventy-one Greek and Latin inscriptions found or purchased in Antioch and Daphne, ninety-three names, of which twenty-one names are latin, five are Semitic, one Egyptian, and one doubtful; the remaining sixty-five names are all Greek.[2] The inscription with the Egyptian name Isis (Ἶσις) was purchased at Ain-Djamous near Daphne and its source is unknown.[3] The doubtful name ΓολΒ [4] was found in Antioch near the eastern gate which could correspond to the Jewish quarter. Of the five Semitic names deriving from Aramaic, the one, Chalkomas (Χαλκομας),[5] was found on the mosaic of Yakto near Daphne above a figure probably representing a slave pouring wine to another person lying on

---

[1]Justin xxxix. 1. 5.

[2]AOR, I, 52-53; II, 148-164; III, 83-114.

[3]AOR, III, 101, No. 202.

[4]AOR, II, 150, No. 24; see Downey's explanation on this Aramaic or Hebrew name of a person or of a profession.

[5]Χαλκομας, transcription of Elcomas or Hilcomas, meaning "God keeps me," from the Syriac خمر and حمر meaning "to keep." See J. Lassus, "La mosaïque de Yakto," in AOR, I, 133, who thinks it means "God is my share" (Dieu est ma part).

the ground with the name Μάρκελλος (from the Latin Marcellus). The mosaic goes back to the fifth century A.D.[1] Of the other four Semitic names found in Antioch, two were found in the cruciform church of Antioch, going back to the fourth century A.D.[2] One of these two is Μαρθανα [3] who was probably a donator to the church, the other is Ακκιβα [4] with the title of deacon and paramonarius (διακόνου καὶ παραμοναρίου). The other two Semitic names from Antioch are similar, Μάλχος ,[5] both found on tombs. The Latin names found in the Latin inscriptions seem to be well engraved and preserved, and whenever they bear any identification, related either to high Roman officials or to soldiers. Thus, for example, we have the cursus honorum of L. Maecius Postumus (dated ca. 69-72 A.D.) who was in the time of Vespasian and Titus one of the Arval brothers.[6] We have likewise the name of a soldier called Claudius Surus on a tombstone.[7] The Greek names in the inscriptions are very much varied, but rarely have any Macedonian names. We have noticed just one name, Φιλπικός;[8] and it is worth remarking that this is much

---

[1]Lassus, "La mosaique de Yakto," in AOR, I, 133.

[2]Lassus, "L'église cruciforme," in AOR, II, 40 ff.

[3]Marthana might be a derivation from מרתא; cf. Heinz Wuthnow, Die semitischen Menschennamen in griechischen Inschriften und Papyri des Vorderen Orients (Leipzig, 1930), p. 72; Lassus, "L'église cruciforme," op. cit., II, 40.

[4]Akkiba might be derived from עקיבא; cf. Wuthnow, op. cit., p. 15; Lassus, "L'église cruciforme, op. cit., II, 42.

[5]AOR, II, 153, 156, Nos. 37, 58; the one is Μαχος in the inscription, but Downey thinks the λ is omitted for it could not be a name ending in μαχος because it seems to be complete. The other is Αλχο which Downey has restored as Μάλχος.

[6]AOR, I, 52, No. 1.

[7]AOR, II, 150, No. 17.

[8]AOR, II, 163, No. 104.

different from the names in a Macedonian colony like Doura, where until the first century A.D., the Macedonian names were perpetuated from grandfather to grandson.[1] Some of the Greek names in Antioch are theophoric like Ἀθηναΐς ,[2] Ἀρτεμιδώρα[3] and we do not know if they were possibly translations of Semitic theophoric names.[4]

The question would naturally arise, because of the great number of Greek names and the scarcity of Semitic ones,[5] if we should necessarily conclude that the Aramaic, or Semitic element in general, was so little and insignificant in proportion to the Greek element. The answer is certainly not. We have warned at the beginning of this study of names against the risk of inference about race from names, due to possible descent from mixed parents, possible translation or change of names for various reasons, or mere adoption of Greek names by the natives. Some of the sixty-five Greek names found in Antioch might have been examples of the cases we warned against. We have no means of telling whether some of these names were given by a Greek father and an Aramean mother, nor can we tell if the names were those of persons having

---

[1]Cumont, Fouilles, p. 341; Some of these Macedonian names are Alexandrus, Archelaus, Seleucus, Antiochus, Antigonus, Nikanor.

[2]AOR, II, 155, No. 54, of the second century A.D.

[3]AOR, II, 161, No. 92.

[4]Mark Lidzbarski, Altsemitische Texte (Giessen, 1907), p. 38, No. 45 gives a bilingual inscription of a Sidonian in Athens where the name Artemidorus is translated in the same inscription עבדתנת, and Heliodorus is likewise translated עבדשמש. For other bilinguals see M. Lidzbarski, Ephemeris für semitische Epigraphik (2 vols.; Giessen, 1902-1908), II, 157.

[5]We shall discuss the language of the inscriptions later on in this chapter, in the section on language.

more Aramean than Greek blood or no Greek blood at all, and yet their parents chose to give them a Greek name in the same way as a modern Syrian with any contact with the West would choose to give his children a modern European name, or would translate and transcribe the native name in different forms, making for example Lillian out of Layla, and Claire out of Nūr, and John out of Hanna. On the other hand, the proportion of Latin to Aramaic and Greek names will show the truth of what we are saying; for if that proportion were to be taken seriously, we should conclude that the size of the Latin element was greater than the Semitic including the Aramaic element, which is not possible owing to what we have already said concerning the small or temporary settlement of the Latin element in Antioch,[1] and owing to what we know about the existence of a Jewish community numbering few tens of thousands.[2] The Latin names, evidently belonging to important or official persons were well engraved on durable monuments and so were well preserved. In the same way, the four Aramaic names have been preserved either in a church in one case, or in the other case in a cemetery probably belonging to rich families.

Thus the overwhelming proportion of Greek names is no proof of the overwhelming proportion of the Greek element. Another proof of this comes from the villages. It is a well-known fact that the population of the villages consisted of Syrian Arameans.[3] Yet the Greek and even Syriac inscriptions from the villages to the east of Antioch and as far as Aleppo and even farther, have kept for us a record of Greek names, of Semitic

---

[1] Supra, pp. 57 ff. [2] Supra, p. 62.

[3] Bouchier, Syria as a Roman Province, p. 56; C. O. Müller, op. cit., p. 29; Jones, op. cit., p. 295.

names corrupted to suit Greek endings, and of double names. Sometimes we find in one inscription two parts, one with Greek, the other with Aramaic names, such as the one found in Babisqa in Djabal Barisha, east of Antioch, from the second century A.D., with the names of Αντωνιος Ἡρωδης Αλεξανδρος in the first part, and Συβαβας Βαρικβήλου in the second.[1] We have cases where the son has a Semitic and the father has a Greek name as Μαλχός Μενάνδρου found in Riha southeast of Antioch.[2] In Meʿez in Djabal Barisha we have an instance of a double name with Μικκαλος ὁ ἐπικα(λουμενος) Ζααρουγας Δομετιου .[3] In the village of Bšindelaya in Djabal Al-Aʿla east of Antioch we have inscriptions with Greek names such as Τι(βέριον) Κλ(αύδιον) Σώσανδρον.[4] Even in far away Khanāṣir (Ἀνάσαρθα), in a mountainous region about sixty kilometers southeast of Aleppo, we find a man spoken of in an inscription as "pious branch of noble descent, the glorious Gregarios" as late as the year 604 A.D.[5] In the Syriac inscriptions we have noticed the same mixture of Greek and Semitic names such as

---

[1]L. Jalabert and René Mouterde, Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie (referred to hereafter as IGLS) (2 vols.; Paris, 1929-1939), II, 304, No. 556, dated 143 A.D. The names are Συβαβας from the Aramaic שבב Syriac ܫܒܒ meaning "neighbor"; Βαρικβήλος is the Aramaic ברך בעל meaning "Baal has blessed"; cf. Wuthnow, op. cit., pp. 113, 33.

[2]IGLS, II, 375, No. 688, dated 421 A.D.

[3]IGLS, II, 316, No. 581, dated 157 A.D. The sense of the name Ζααρουγας remains unknown. Mouterde suggests, "the man from Saruj."

[4]IGLS, II, 344, No. 631, dated 134 A.D.

[5]IGLS, I, 161, No. 281; Mouterde suggests that he might be an Arab phylarch. Compare with him the case of that notable of Uruk-Warqa called Anu-Uballit whose other name is Kefalon in 202 B.C. and the Greek names of his progeny studied by Bowman in "Anu-Uballit--Kefalon," op. cit., pp. 231-243.

"Eusebius son of Zakkai" חסדי בר זכי,[1] and in the graffiti, we have Semitic names like Marzuq מרזוק,[2] and on the other hand Greek names like Theon θיאן.[3] In the villages of Hauran in central Syria, genuine Arab names were corrupted to fit Greek forms, such as that Αὐθός Ὀσιδοῦ who is no other than the Arabic غَوث بن أُسَيد and Ροδεινάνα Αὐθοῦ who is رُدَينة بنت غوث.[4]

The list is long and examples could be multiplied. Many native rulers of Syria adopted Greek names such as Ptolemy son of Mennaeus,[5] the Arab ruler of Chalcis in the Lebanon, and his son Lysanias[6] in the first century B.C. The names of others were put in a Greek form as Azizus and Samsigeramus of Emesa in the first century A.D.[7] All these Greek names, in villages more or less distant from Antioch, and in far away places in Syria, were used

---

[1] Publications of an American Archaeological Expedition to Syria in 1899-1900, Part IV Semitic inscriptions, ed. Enno Littmann (New York: Century Co., 1904), p. 14, No. 5. The name חסדי derives from the verb חסד "to be guiltless or innocent," or "to conquer." The pael is חסדי "to grant victory."

[2] Publications of the Princeton University Archaeological Expeditions to Syria in 1904-5 and 1909, Division IV, Section B, ed. Enno Littmann (Leyden: E. J. Brill, 1934), p. 26, No. 28 found in Deir Seman. The name seems to derive from Arabic رزق to donate or give wealth; the name means "the one to whom it is given."

[3] Ibid., p. 29, No. 30 found in Deir Semân.

[4] R. Dussaud and F. Macler, Mission dans les régions désertiques de la Syrie moyenne (Paris, 1903), p. 284, Nos. 133, 134 from the village of Umm-el-Djemâl.

[5] Josephus Antiquities xiii. 392.

[6] Josephus Jewish Wars I. 440.

[7] Josephus Antiquities xix. 338; xx. 139; the name Samsigeramus, sometimes written Sampsigeramus (with p) is from the Aramaic גרם "to be strong," pael גרם "to strengthen," גרם "strength," and means "Shemesh, the Sun god, has strengthened."

among a population that was Greek neither by race nor by language.[1]

We have moreover a multitude of Greek administrative titles in villages and centers whose population consisted of Arameans and Arabs. Evidently, the use of these titles was adopted in the relations of the villages with the administration.[2]

Thus we are led to conclude that the study of names could not indicate the relative proportion of racial groups in Antioch, nor throw a decisive light on our question of race. In an age when the Arameans in the villages were using Greek names and titles, and when certain persons of the educated classes in the cities were even speaking of themselves as Greeks, as we have shown, although they were not Greeks by blood, we should really not be surprised to find the use of Greek names spread among the population of Antioch even though they were not Greeks by race.

Let us now see what was the language of the people of Antioch and if it can throw any light on the problem of race and nationality.

The Language of the Antiochenes

We shall see in the course of this study that the three

---

[1]Chrysostom Homilies on the Statues xix. 2 on the different language of the villages, which we will study in more detail.

[2]George McLean Harper, Jr., "Village Administration in the Roman Province of Syria," Yale Classical Studies, I (1928), 118 mentions the titles of πρωτοκωμήτης, κωμάρχοι, στρατήγοι in the villages of Trachonitis; ibid., p. 121 gives a list of strategoi in the village of Shaara in Trachonitis, many of them bearing corrupted Arab names: Πρόκλος Γιρμανοῦ καὶ Σαῖος Ζοβαιδοῦ καὶ Ἀδδίος Αβαβοῦ στρατηγοὶ ἀνέθηκον. Ibid., p. 122 for offices of pistoi, dioiketai, epimeletai, ekdikoi; ibid., p. 142 for village assemblies τὸ κοινὸν τῆς κώμης . Cf. Jones, op. cit., pp. 285-292.

languages, Greek, Latin, and Aramaic were used in Antioch; and the question arises, what proportion of the people used Greek, and what proportion used Latin and Aramaic? The question, we must admit, is difficult to determine. Also, it is necessary to make a distinction at the very start between the written and the spoken language of that population. For, if we were to judge the relative use of the languages by the written remains of each, we would have to conclude that Aramaic was not used at all in Antioch, which is not the case as we shall show. The inscriptions found in Antioch so far are almost all Greek, and very few are Latin, but none are Aramaic. Among the one hundred and seventy-one inscriptions we have mentioned for the study of names in Antioch, thirteen only are in Latin, the rest are in Greek.[1] We do not know if the future will reveal any Aramaic inscriptions in Antioch, but on the basis of what we have, we should conclude that Greek was the written language of Antioch used in documents, literature, and monuments. The educated Antiochenes of whom we have spoken wrote in Greek as a general rule. We shall show that Latin had a limited use in writing and speech since the Roman period. The legends on the coins of Antioch are in Greek whether they come from the Seleucid or from the Roman periods,[2] whereas in some Phoenician cities, we have few legends on coins in Phoenician from the first two centuries B.C.,[3] and few others in Latin.[4]

---

[1] AOR, I, 52-53; II, 148-164; III, 83-114.

[2] Barclay Head, Historia Numorum (Oxford, 1911), pp. 757-781.

[3] Ibid., pp. 790, 791 from Berytus and Gebal-Byblos in the second century B.C.; Babelon, op. cit., p. 84, Plate XIV, No. 16 from Berytus: 𐤁𐤓𐤕 𐤊𐤕𐤉𐤀 𐤒𐤃𐤌𐤕
p. 85, Plate XIV, No. 18 from Gebal: 𐤂𐤁𐤋 𐤋𐤀𐤋𐤕

[4] British Museum Guide to the Principal Coins of the Greeks (London, 1932), p. 89, Plate XLIX, Nos. 35, 36 for coins of Sidon with legend in Latin from the time of Elagabalus.

Evidently the pre-Christian native literature which was driven out by the new Greek culture as barbarian, continued to be ignored in the Christian period as pagan;[1] and when the Syrian idiom became a written language and developed a literature of its own since the second century A.D., especially for the propagation of Christianity,[2] Greek writing continued to be used in Antioch until the Arab conquest, even by Monophysites[3] who were creating a native literature and detaching themselves from the Greek language.[4] But all this does not prove that the Aramaic tongue was driven from everyday speech even in the City of Antioch. In other words, the mass of material written in Greek is not conclusive evidence for its being the only spoken language, in the same way as the mass of material written in Greek and found in the villages does not prove that the villagers spoke Greek. We have noticed from the 441 Greek inscriptions found in the villages east of Antioch as far as Aleppo,[5] that Greek writing was widely used in the villages; for only five of all this great mass of Greek inscriptions have any Syriac writing mixed with them, and only as late as the fifth and sixth centuries. The Syriac inscriptions are still a minority compared to the number of Greek inscriptions,

---

[1] Bevan, op. cit., I, 228; cf. Bowman, "Arameans, Aramaic and the Bible," op. cit., p. 86 speaks of Aramaic compelled to exist outside cities and in remote places, so that Aramaic dialects appeared with variations in the alphabet.

[2] Mommsen, op. cit., II, 124.

[3] R. Duval in P.OR, IV, 5 speaking of the homilies and selected letters of Severus, Monophysite bishop of Antioch 512-518, written in Greek.

[4] Syrisch-Römisches Rechtsbuch auf dem fünften Jahrhundert, ed. and trans. K. G. Bruns and Eduard Sachau (Leipzig, 1880), p. 174.

[5] IGLS, Vol. II containing the inscriptions from Chalcidene, Djabal Barisha, Djabal Samʿān and Djabal Al-Aʿla.

for they count less than a hundred.[1] They are almost all religious inscriptions and are as late as the fifth and sixth centuries. It has been maintained that the increased use of the native language in northern Syria in the sixth century is a sign of the growth of national spirit finding expression in, and enhanced by, the Monophysite church,[2] yet we find in distant Khanāṣir, southeast of Aleppo, in a Monophysite environment in the sixth century a Greek inscription dated 546 A.D.[3] But in spite of all that, we know that the language of the country was not Greek, and Chrysostom has left a testimony concerning even the near villages of Antioch, so near that their inhabitants could come to Antioch on feast days. He referred to them as "different from us in speech, but in harmony with us concerning the faith."[4] Thus the Greek language of the inscriptions did not prove that the villagers spoke Greek; their language was Syriac.

This statement of Chrysostom on the different language of the villages, if we may make a small digression, has been used by different modern scholars to prove that the countryside was "utterly unaffected by Hellenism."[5] To this we may say that the people, not

---

[1] Publications of an American Archaeological Expedition, pp. 9-56, contains twenty-four Syriac inscriptions from northern Syria all from the sixth century A.D.; Publications of the Princeton University Archaeological Expedition, pp. 4-56, contains sixty-one Syriac inscriptions from northern Syria between Antioch and Aleppo.

[2] Publications of an American Archaeological Expedition, p. 4.

[3] IGLS, II, 166, No. 289, dated 546 A.D., contains with the Trisagion formula, the Monophysite addition " ὁ σταυρωθεὶς δι' ἡμᾶς ."

[4] Chrysostom Homilies on the Statues xix. 2: λαὸς κατὰ μὲν τὴν γλῶτταν ἡμῖν ἐνηλλαγμένος, κατὰ δὲ τὴν πίστιν ἡμῖν συμφωνῶν. The homily was made on Sunday before Ascension Day, referring to those who came from the villages of Antioch.

[5] Jones, op. cit., p. 295; Baur, op. cit., I, 30; Rostovtzeff, The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire, p. 281.

only in the country, but even in the cities, need not change their native language every time they are affected by another culture; for language is not the only proof of the effect of culture. The people of Antioch themselves did not adopt Latin as a common language, yet we have proofs, into which we need not go now, that Roman culture influenced them in more than one way. The villages, as we have shown, used the Greek language for writing and adopted Greek names and titles, and this was not all,[1] yet it is enough to say that they were not "utterly unaffected by Hellenism."

With Greek as a written language in Antioch, Latin was also used for official purposes and very slightly in literature since the Roman period. Imperial edicts were composed in Latin but were translated into Greek. Josephus tells us that Mark Antony sent an edict to the magistrates, senate, and people of Tyre,[2] Sidon, Antioch, and Aradus,[3] to have it registered in public tablets in Latin and Greek characters, and to keep it in the most conspicuous place that it might be read by everybody. We have already referred to the thirteen inscriptions found in Antioch relating to high Roman officials and Roman soldiers. Perdrizet refers to two undated Greek inscriptions found in Antioch at the

---

[1]Joseph Mattern, Villes mortes de Haute Syrie (2d ed.; Beyrouth, 1944), p. 100 speaks of Meez in Djabal Barisha and its porticoes and basilicas. De Vogüé, Syrie Centrale, architecture civile et religieuse (Paris, 1865), I, Pl. 56: the thermae of Serdjilla; II, 135, 138 for other Hellenized villages. Enno Littmann in Publications of an American Archaeological Expedition, p. 3 says that the influence of the Hellenistic culture of Antioch was one of the main reasons for the poor literary activity in Syriac west of the Euphrates.

[2]Josephus Antiquities xiv. 12. 319.

[3]Ibid. xiv. 12. 323.

end of the last century in which the Greek is tinged with Latin.[1] In the one, the word ἄρκα is used which is the transcription of the Latin arca. In the other there is a reference to the games at Daphne in which chariot and horse races constituted an important part, and the term used for them is κιρκήσια which is the Latin circensia. Thus, Latin was penetrating Greek but to a small extent in spite of the long period of Roman rule. As for literature, we have already referred to Ammianus who wrote in Latin, but he had already moved to Rome, and he used Greek words to make his meaning clear and sometimes he put Greek words into Latin characters.[2] Latin studies in general were not popular, and Libanius boasts that his uncle Phasganius proudly refused to learn Latin.[3] Yet in that same fourth century Libanius deplored the fact that many sons of senators were going to study law in Rome or Beyrut, believing that the teaching of the sophists was no longer useful.[4] Thus a great impetus was given to the study of Latin by the study of Roman Law.

In one important instance Libanius has left us a proof that Latin was used, not only in official or literary language, but also in spoken language. He was speaking about the stages of decay of the Olympic Games, and among other signs of that decay, he mentioned the disorder during the games, and then "the mixing with the Greek words of some Latin words" (μιγνύναι ταῖς τῶν Ἑλλήνων αἱ Ῥωμαίων),[5] which shows, not only that there were a few elements who spoke Latin, but that to

---

[1]Perdrizet, op. cit., pp. 289-291.

[2]Supra, p. 87, n. 1. [3]Libanius Or. xlix. 29.

[4]Libanius Or. xlv. 27; Libanius Or. xxxix. 17; Pack, op. cit., pp. 39, 67, 118.

[5]Libanius Or. x. 14-15.

a sophist like Libanius, the sound of Latin words in the Olympic Games was a stage of decay. It is noteworthy that Libanius does not make mention of any words in the Syriac tongue, as if he took it for granted that nothing else could, or should be spoken by the Antiochenes except Greek.

If it is certain that Latin was used in Antioch, we must admit that it was not used to the extent to which its dignity as the language of the rulers entitled it. We even have evidence that the Roman governors in general not only knew Greek, but spoke to the people in Greek on certain occasions. Tacitus informs us that when Mucianus, the Roman legate, spoke to the crowd in the theatre for the elevation of Vespasian to the throne, he spoke in Greek.[1] It was already a century since the Romans began to rule in Antioch. When Caesar Gallus was in Antioch in 353 A.D., as governor of the whole East, he used to roam about the inns and street corners inquiring of everyone in Greek, of which he had a remarkable command, what he thought of the Caesar.[2] Ammianus tells us about a governor called Musonianus sent to govern the East in 354 A.D., and speaks of him as "famous for his command of both languages,"[3] meaning Latin and Greek. The fact is that Greek was another official language along with Latin, even more important since it was the lingua franca of the whole Roman East, and the language of the educated classes. Roman emperors were almost as a rule interested in Greek studies;[4] and the satires of Juvenal

---

[1]Tacitus The Histories ii. 80.

[2]Ammianus xiv. 1. 9.

[3]Ibid., xv. 13. 1.

[4]Suetonius The Lives of the Caesars, ed. and trans. John C. Rolfe, Loeb Classical Library (2 vols.; Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press; London: W. Heinemann, 1946) Augustus ii. 89; Tiberius iii. 70; Caligula iv. 3; Nero vi. 49. Lampridius

inform us in the first century A.D., with evident exaggeration, that women talk nothing but Greek in Rome.[1] The influence of the Greek language was so strong that even when few Syriac legal terms were taken from Latin, they kept the terminal Greek forms instead of the Latin original forms.[2]

We have mentioned already a few testimonies concerning the widespread use of Greek as a spoken language in Antioch such as that of Libanius considering it horrible that Latin voices should mix with the Greek ones in the Olympic Games, and that of Chrysostom speaking of the villagers as "different from us in language," as if implying naturally that the language of the Antiochenes was Greek. One could conclude from other testimonies connected with the critical spirit and libels used by the Antiochenes that they, not only spoke Greek but were familiar with Greek folklore and legends using them in common speech. Lucian in the second century portrays the people of Antioch as very attentive and critical in the theatre, so that if a small man came on in the character of Hector, they all cried out with one voice: "Here is Astyanax, and where is Hector?"[3] Ammianus tells us in another

---

Severus Alexander 27 in SHA: "Severus could deliver orations in Greek better than in Latin." Fronto, op. cit., I, 146 on Marcus Aurelius writing a letter to the senate in Greek.

[1]Juvenal vi. 184-199.

[2]Syrisch-Römisches Rechtsbuch, Part II, 156 ff. for a complete list; as examples:

ܠܓܛܘܢ = λεγατόν instead of legatum
ܐܢܕܝܩܛܝܘ = ἰνδικτίων instead of indictio
ܐܡܐܢܩܝܦܐܛܝ = ἐμαγκίπατοι instead of emancipati.

[3]Lucian On the Pantomime 76; Fowler in his translation of Lucian's Works, I, xxviii says: "We do not know how much irony and how much truth there is in the description of Lucian"; yet it is permitted to think that he was portraying an aspect of the truth about the population among whom he might have lived after 160 A.D. for some time.

case that the Antiochenes gave Julian the title of Cercops, and said that he made strides as if he were the brother of Otus and Ephialtes (giants in the Odyssey).[1] John of Antioch relates that the Antiochenes, angry with the Emperor Jovian, because he signed a shameful treaty with the Persians, called him a second Paris.[2]

While Latin and especially Greek were used as written and spoken languages in Antioch, and while we have no evidence so far for the use of the Syrian tongue in writing, yet the proofs for its use as a spoken language are not lacking. We have already referred to the Aramaic nicknames of certain Seleucid kings of the second century B.C., and to the five Aramaic names found in inscriptions in the Roman period which presuppose that a part of the population was Aramaic speaking. Theodoret gives us more conclusive evidence. He not only speaks of the Greek language as one which he shares "in a way,"[3] meaning by that probably that his mother tongue was Syriac, but he cites the case of Macedonius, the hermit living in the mountain above Antioch, who came down after the sedition of 387 and spoke to the imperial commissioners in the Syriac tongue, and the translators reduced his words into Greek.[4] The case of Macedonius as a hermit speaking the Syriac tongue would have been insignificant, if Theodoret did not tell us that he lived for forty-five years near Antioch, and used to come often to the city. Ignorant of the Greek tongue, there must have been surely some people with whom he did talk in his Syrian tongue.

---

[1]Ammianus xxii. 14. 3. The nickname Cercops refers to imaginary people living in Sicily changed into apes.

[2]Duncombe, op. cit., II, 348.

[3]Supra, p. 88, n. 2.

[4]Theodoret Religiosa Historia in P.G., LXXXII, 1404: τοῦ ἑρμηνέως εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα φωνὴν μεταφέροντος.

In addition to this, Theodoret tells us that the title of Macedonius in Antioch was the "barley eater" (κριθοφάγον) because of his food, and on the other hand, certain people called him "the cistern" because he lived in a deep pit (ὀρύγματι βαθεῖ, ὅθεν καὶ Γουβᾶν αὐτὸν ἐπωνόμαζον).[1] Now, his other title gouban is significant, for it is the Syriac word ܓܘܒܐ in the Greek accusative form and and means "cistern." The two titles by which Macedonius was known, therefore, seem to imply that the Greek speaking part of the population gave him the title of krithofagon (barley eater) on account of his food, and the Syriac speaking population gave him the title of goub (cistern) on account of the place where he lived, unless a good part of the population spoke both languages and gave him the two titles in two different tongues.

Theodoret informs us about another religious man, Aphraates, of Persian origin, who lived in Antioch in the fourth century. He tells us that he learned a few Greek phrases in a school of philosophy in Antioch, and spoke a semi-barbarous language (τῇ δὲ μιξοβαρβάρῳ κεχρημένος γλώττῃ).[2] Aphraates was in common contact with the people and, being little familiar with Greek, must have found people to understand his Syriac or his semi-barbarous tongue. We have the impression that cases of the use of that semi-barbarous tongue, which was a mixture of incorrect Greek and Syriac, were frequent among the mass of the people. In still another statement, Theodoret is indignant at those who suppose it a dishonor if a barbarian teaches them in the barbarian tongue (ἀλλ' ἀτιμίαν ὑπολαμβάνουσιν

---

[1] Ibid., p. 1400.

[2] Ibid., p. 1368.

εἰ βάρβαρος αὐτοὺς ταύτην τὴν γλῶτταν παιδεύει).[1] Theodoret was speaking in general terms, but while bishop of Cyrrhus, he must have been thinking of his native Antioch where Greek was so much the fashion that a certain class of people resented the teaching of a preacher or a priest who used the Syriac tongue.

We have proof of the use of Syriac also, in the phraseology of a Greek inscription from Antioch, found on the mosaic floor of an inn. It shows the influence of the use of the Syriac tongue which the inn-keepers Mega, Ioannes, and Anthusa must have spoken; for it says: "Peace be your coming in, [you] who gaze [on this], joy and blessing [be] to those who stay here."[2]

These were the languages used in Antioch, so far as our evidence shows: Greek in general as a written language, and Latin to a small degree; Greek in a wide degree as a spoken language, and Latin to a limited degree; as for Syriac, we have proofs of its use, but we cannot tell to what extent. Its use or that of a mixed tongue might have been very wide. We would have liked in such a study to determine, not only the relative importance of each language and the extent to which it was spoken, but the evolution of its use, so as to be able to judge if the tendency from the Seleucid to the Roman and late Roman periods was to speak more Greek or more Syriac or a common mixed tongue. To determine this, a series of dated documents and testimonies from each century with sufficient instances would have been necessary; we do not possess such material and for certain periods, such as the

---

[1]Theodoret Graecorum Affectionum Curatio in P.G. LXXXIII, 792.

[2]Downey, "Greek and Latin Inscriptions," in AOR, III, 83, No. 111: Εἰρήνη ἡ εἴσοδος σου, ὁ βλέπων χαρὰ καὶ εὐλογία τοῖς μένουσιν ὧδε.

Seleucid, we are very badly informed. The testimony of Apollonius of Tyana and Philostratus in the first and second centuries A.D., might have referred, not only to the people as half barbarous and uncultivated, but to their Greek language becoming mixed and half barbarous.[1] The testimonies of Libanius and Chrysostom in the fourth century[2] seem to indicate that Greek was still the common language of the people, possibly in a more or less mixed form. With Theodoret in the fifth century we begin to feel that Syriac is gaining ground, although Theodoret himself refers to it as a barbarous, which means, foreign tongue.

If it is true that the use of the Greek language was widespread in Antioch whether in writing or in speech, would it reflect on the race and nationality of the Antiochenes and indicate that they were mostly Greeks? Instances from other places seem to indicate that it need not. The studies of Cumont on the names in Doura have shown, as we have explained already,[3] that the population of Doura changed from a distinct Greek majority in the second century B.C., to a distinct Semitic majority in the third century A.D. Yet his study of the 134 inscriptions and of the parchments dating from 6 B.C. to the third century has shown a continuous use of Greek in the city until its abandon, even though it was ruled by the Parthians and Persians throughout this whole period. Greek was even used by the common people.[4] Thus the continuous use of Greek, at least as a written language, in Doura had no relation with the race predominantly Semitic, except in

---

[1] Supra, p. 82, n. 5; p. 83, nn. 1-2.

[2] Supra, p. 111.

[3] Supra, p. 96, n. 4; p. 97, n. 1.

[4] Cumont, Fouilles, pp. 339-340.

the fact that the Greek of Doura was not as correct in the first century A.D. as it had been one century earlier,[1] which would hold true of Antioch also according to the words of Apollonius of Tyana. We have, on the other hand, the case of the ruling families of Cappadocia, Bithynia, and Pontus in the Hellenistic period, who adopted the Greek language, although they were neither Greeks nor Macedonians.[2]

The Race and Nationality of the Antiochenes

We have tried so far by means of literary evidence from Antiochene and non-Antiochene writers to determine what was considered to be the race and nationality of the people of Antioch in the Hellenistic-Roman period. We have also used epigraphic and literary material for the study of names and for the study of the language of the people, hoping that they might help solve our problem. We have found that the writers, including the Antiochenes themselves, who referred to the people of Antioch as Greeks, were thinking probably of the strong tradition of Greek education and culture, and of the historical origins of the population during the period of foundation. The evidence on the names and language of the people could not prove that they were Greeks by race. It only helped to strengthen that particular sense in which the writers viewed the Antiochenes as Greeks. As for the writers who spoke of the Antiochenes as Syrians, we do not know in what sense they viewed them as such. It could be from a politico-geographical point of view, for Antioch was not only in Syria, but it was under the Seleucids the capital of a kingdom often referred to as the "kingdom of Syria," and whose kings were often known as the

---

[1] Ibid., p. 347.

[2] Jouguet, op. cit., p. 390.

"kings of Syria."[1] Under the Romans it was the capital of the province of Syria. If it is from the racial point of view, and if by race we mean descent and blood, it is certain that the infiltration and settlement of Syrian elements, whether Aramaic or Jewish, had been steady especially since the time when the Seleucids lost Asia Minor and were prevented from recruiting Greek mercenaries.[2] The evidence of names and language proves also the presence of Syrian elements. Yet, one must bear in mind that a good part of the population was of Graeco-Macedonian origin, and a certain part was of Roman or Latin origin, and that the mixture of all these elements was such as not to permit the application of any label of race to that population. The contemporaries themselves were not unanimous in the application of one single epithet to the Antiochenes, nor are we sure in what sense they applied their particular epithet. The testimony of the educated Antiochenes themselves showed that they were not sure what racial or national epithet to apply to themselves. The evidence of names and language, although it does not allow us to call the Antiochenes Greeks, likewise does not allow us to call them Syrians.

As for the question of nationality, and if we understand by nationality a community of feeling and of interests, we doubt if the writers who spoke of the Antiochenes as Greeks or Syrians meant them to be Greeks or Syrians by nationality. In this series of testimonies on the question of race and nationality we should not neglect to look for the testimony of the mass of the Antiochenes themselves. And if, in our last attempt to determine what they were and how they felt, we ask them to what race and to what nationality they belonged, their actions and their history answer

---

[1] Supra, pp. 76-77.

[2] Supra, pp. 52-53, 55.

for them that they belonged to one race and to one nationality, that of the Antiochenes.

Lampridius has left us a passage relating to the Emperor Alexander Severus which says: "He felt shame at being a Syrian especially because, on the occasion of a certain festival, the people of Antioch and Egypt and Alexandria annoyed him with jibes as is their custom calling him a Syrian synagogue chief and a high priest" (et Syrum Archisynagogum eum vocantes et archiereum).[1] The passage refers to the high priest of the Syrian Sungod of Emesa which was in Alexander's family on his mother's side. And it is evident that if the Antiochenes had considered themselves Syrians, they would probably not have ridiculed a Roman emperor of Syrian descent and who, moreover, was high priest of a Syrian god.

Moreover, the epigrams of Meleager[2] have already shown us that the people of that age did not have our modern conception of race and nationality. They remembered essentially the place where they were born or where they lived. The state for them was the city, and the nation was the mass of citizens of a city. This is the reason why, probably, Fowler translates πόλις by "state" or "country" when it occurs in Lucian's Patriotism or Praise of the Fatherland.[3] Lucian himself implies in that same work that one's country is one's city, and when he speaks of the true patriotic feeling, he says it is that of the born citizen, not the naturalized,[4] and he mentions neither race nor country outside the narrow

---

[1]Lampridius Severus Alexander 28 in SHA.

[2]Supra, pp. 89-91.

[3]Lucian Works, trans. Fowler, IV, 23 ff., Sections 2, 5, 8; ed. Jacobitz, III, 202 ff.

[4]Lucian Patriotism 10, trans. Fowler: "If you would know

circle of the city. Libanius gives us the same impression, that of a city patriotism leaving place for no attachment to any country or race, except to the city and its people.[1] He is indignant at the senators of Antioch because they flatter the governor, and because, while the senators are like beggars on account of their inferior land, the others, wherever they come from, pay the price and live riotously on the former owners' property.[2] Chrysostom himself who never expressed any attachment to any particular land or race, shows a deep feeling of Antiochene nationalism or of city patriotism after the sedition of 387 when he says: "Nothing is sweeter than one's country, but now it has come to pass that nothing is more bitter,"[3] referring to Antioch trembling from the fear of the emperor's punishment. When Libanius boasts of the Greek descent of the Antiochenes, his boasting should not be viewed as an attempt to connect the people of his city with a particular race or nation, but simply as an attempt to exalt his city above all others and emphasize its Hellenic tradition and culture in an age when the sophists were more concerned about the fate of Hellenism and paganism in regard to Christianity than about questions of race and nationality.[4]

---

the true man's feeling for his country, it is in the born citizen (γνησίοις πολίταις) that you must study it; the merely naturalized are a sort of bastards ever ready for another change."

[1]Libanius Or. xi. The idea runs throughout the whole oration.

[2]Pack, op. cit., p. 34; Libanius Or. ii. 35 ff.

[3]Chrysostom Homilies on the Statues ii. 4.

[4]We do not know how much credit to give to Sozomen's passage (Sozomen Ecclesiastical History v. 3) saying that when the people of Nisibis implored Julian's help against the Persians, he refused to help them unless they return to paganism, because they were Christians: a significant instance of an emperor placing the interests of paganism above those of the state.

Even the term γένος was used often in relation to a city and not to a race. When Lucian speaks of certain Syrians from Damascus he says, "ἐκ Δαμασκοῦ τῷ γένει ,"[1] which literally would mean "by race [or by descent], from Damascus." Socrates Scholasticus uses it in the same sense for a certain Meropius, "a Tyrian by race."[2] Strabo spoke of the "race of the Alexandrians" (γένος τὸ τῶν Ἀλεξανδρέων)[3] meaning the citizens of Alexandria.

Cities had rivalries between them and even wars; such was their jealousy for their autonomy and prestige, although they were under the rule of a great kingdom. Poseidonius gave us an account of a war between Larissa and Apamea in 142 B.C., in the Seleucid period.[4] Herodian mentions the envy between Antioch and Laodicea which made the former support Niger in 194 A.D., while the latter supported Severus for the throne of the empire.[5]

Thus the Antiochenes, we must admit, had no regard for any country or race outside the limits of their city and its territory. They sympathized with other countries, races, and dynasties, even those that were seated in their very midst, only in the measure in which they were good and useful to them.[6] This city patriotism which could correspond to our modern notion of racial and national feeling, was common to the cities of the Hellenistic-Roman period.[7]

---

[1]Lucian Tragopodagra, ed. Jacobitz, III, 451.

[2]Socrates i. 19.

[3]Strabo xvii. 797.

[4]Athenaeus iv. 176.

[5]Herodian iii. 3. 3.

[6]We shall devote a whole chapter to the analysis of this aspect of their character, in connection with the charges of fickleness and riotousness brought against them.

[7]Bevan, op. cit., I, 3; Rostovtzeff, The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire, p. 135.

It becomes evident that, when Renan described the Antiochenes as "a perfect model of those crowds devoted to Caesarism, without country, without nationality,"[1] he missed the mark. For the Antiochenes certainly had a country; it was their city. They likewise had a nationality, which was the Antiochene nationality. The detailed account which Procopius left about the defense of Antioch by its own inhabitants against the Persians of Chosroes in 540 is very significant; it shows that, while the Roman soldiers were running away from Antioch and riding with their horses over women and children near the overcrowded gates, the young men of Antioch were fighting the Persians fiercely in the streets and public squares.[2]

Thus, after a study of the various elements that entered into the population of Antioch, and after an examination of evidence on the racial structure of that population, we have not been able to find a more accurate racial or national label to apply to the Antiochenes except that of the "Antiochene race and nationality."

---

[1]Renan, op. cit., p. 198.

[2]Procopius The History of the Wars ii. 8. 17.

CHAPTER IV

THE CHARACTER OF THE ANTIOCHENE POPULATION

THE SO-CALLED FICKLE, SATIRIC, AND RIOTOUS CHARACTER OF THE ANTIOCHENES

Some of the most outstanding historical writers of modern times have left us a rather dark picture of the character of the population of Antioch. One would think they were attempting to overdo one another in emphasizing the bad traits of the character of that population without trying to explain them. But sometimes, in the course of their historical narrative, the facts betray their one-sided estimate, and one discovers the injustice of their evaluation. We shall begin our study by citing the estimates given by some of these writers, which are repeated in slightly different form by more modern historians of the Hellenistic-Roman period in general and of Antioch in particular.

Gibbon speaks of the Antiochenes in the following terms in connection with his narrative on the sojourn of the Emperor Julian in Antioch:

> The warmth of the climate disposed the natives[1] to the most intemperate enjoyment of tranquillity and opulence, and the lively licentiousness of the Greeks was blended with the hereditary softness of the Syrians. Fashion was the only law, pleasure the only pursuit, and the splendour of dress and furniture was the only distinction of the citizens of Antioch.[2]

---

[1] The term "natives" should be taken to mean "the population" and not any particular part of it.

[2] Edward Gibbon, The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire (2 vols.; New York: The Modern Library, 1932), I, 799, n. 11 says: "The Satire of Julian and the Homilies of St. Chrysostom exhibit the same picture of Antioch." The fact is that those were his principal sources for this picture.

> The arts of luxury were honoured, the serious and manly virtues were the subject of ridicule, and the contempt for female modesty and reverent age announced the universal corruption of the capital of the East. The love of spectacles was the taste, or rather passion, of the Syrians; the most skilful artists were procured from the adjacent cities; a considerable share of the revenue was devoted to the public amusements, and the magnificence of the games, of the theatre and circus was considered as the happiness and as the glory of Antioch. . . . The effeminate Orientals could neither imitate nor admire the severe simplicity which Julian always maintained and sometimes affected.[1]

In another passage he says: "The lively impatience of the inhabitants of Antioch was never satisfied with their own situation or with the character and conduct of their successive sovereigns."[2]

Ernest Renan gives us not only a dark but a horrible picture of the degree of corruption reached by the human race at Antioch, when he speaks of the people in the following terms:

> C'était un ramas inouï de bateleurs, de charlatans, de mimes, de magiciens, de thaumaturges, de sorciers, de prêtres imposteurs; une ville de courses, de jeux, de danses, de processions, de fêtes, de bacchanales; un luxe effréné, toutes les folies de l'Orient, les superstitions les plus malsaines, le fanatisme de l'orgie. Tour à tour serviles et ingrats, lâches et insolents, les Antiochéniens étaient le modèle accompli de ces foules vouées au césarisme, sans patrie, sans nationalité, sans honneur de famille, sans nom à garder. Le grand Corso qui traversait la ville était comme un théâtre où roulaient tout le jour les flots d'une population futile, légère, changeante, émeutière, parfois spirituelle, occupée de chansons, de parodies, de plaisanteries, d'impertinences de toute espèce. ... Ce fleuve de boue qui, sortant par l'embouchure de l'Oronte, venait inonder Rome, avait là sa source principale.[3]

Mommsen mentions essentially their love of pleasure saying: "In no city in antiquity was the enjoyment of life so much the main thing and its duties so incidental as in Antioch."[4]

---

[1] Gibbon, op. cit., I, 799-800.

[2] Ibid., II, 986.

[3] E. Renan, Les apôtres (20th ed.; Paris, 1910), pp. 219 ff.

[4] Mommsen, op. cit., II, 128.

These writers of the last two centuries derived their information from any source that had anything to say against the life and manners of the Antiochenes and particularly from Philostratus' Life of Apollonius of Tyana, Julian's Misopogon, Chrysostom's Homilies, and some of the Orations of Libanius, and made no mention of the bright side in the character of the people which was described by some of these same sources such as Libanius and Chrysostom, as we shall see.

The other writers have taken their information from the same sources with the same one-sided spirit. D. G. Hogarth says: "The inhabitants of Antioch were turbulent, fickle, and notoriously dissolute."[1] J. S. Howson says:

> The climate made them effeminate and luxurious. . . . The love of frivolous amusements became a passion in the contests of the Hippodrome. . . . Another fault should be mentioned as a marked characteristic of Antioch. Her citizens were singularly addicted to ridicule and scurrilous wit, and the invention of nicknames.[2]

Bouchier gives, on the whole, a similar picture:

> The populace displays an Oriental fickleness and excitability, united with the love of refinement and beauty, the quick wit and keen critical faculties of the Greeks. They delighted in gorgeous and splendid shows, richly adorned colonnades, baths, and public buildings. . . . They would flatter a generous ruler but were equally ready to insult him in his downfall. Any monotony soon wearied them. The internal dissensions of the ruling house in the earlier period, any attempted usurpation under the Romans, at once supplied them with an opportunity of asserting their independence by joining in often hopeless attempts to subvert the established order. . . . Their character lacked earnestness but was capable of shortlived enthusiasm, was turbulent but easily quelled, luxurious, but not inaccessible to nobler motives, and often ready to embrace the severest asceticism.[3]

---

[1]Hogarth, op. cit.

[2]J. S. Howson, "Antiocheia," Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography, ed. W. Smith, Vol. I (1878).

[3]Bouchier, History of Antioch, pp. 22-23.

To believe the picture made by these writers, would be like believing the description of the Antiochenes given by Libanius in his praise of Antioch, and of which Pack says: "The wish often sires the thought and ideals are disguised as realities."[1] For, after describing the ideal situation of Antioch, Libanius says:

> The best land has come to the possession of the best people, as a well built ship is in the possession of good sailors. . . .[2]
>
> . . . . . .
>
> The people are a good complement to the senate, what the one thinks good, the other follows. . . . Every one has a family and lives in an atmosphere of peaceful domesticity. Other lands are less fortunate; the Egyptians are ready to riot at a word, and the Italians become seditious whenever the senate is at a disadvantage. . . . The Antiochenes have an admirable deportment in public, their voice is low and controlled, their gait is decorous, they have civility to their superiors, respect for the educated, urbanity and elegance. . . . In what other people can one find this?[3]

John Chrysostom himself, who, at times, scolded the Antiochenes severely, addresses Antioch and speaks of its populace in these terms after the sedition of 387:

> Who, beloved, has bewitched us? Who has envied us? . . . Nothing was more dignified than our city. . . . The populace so well ordered and quiet, yea, even like a tractable and well tamed steed, always submissive to the hands of its rulers, has now so suddenly started off with us, as to have wrought such evils, as one can hardly dare to mention.[4]

For several centuries the study of the character of the Antiochenes has been dismissed with a few passages of the type we have seen, with no attempt to give it anything like an explanation. With the statements above in mind, and without being apologetic,

---

[1]Pack, op. cit., p. 7.

[2]Libanius Or. xi. 42: ὡς ἡ ἀρίστη τῶν ἀρίστων ἐγένετο....

[3]Ibid. xi. 150 ff: ποῦ ταῦτα ἐν ἄλλῳ δήμῳ;

[4]Chrysostom Homilies on the Statues ii. 2.

we shall make an analysis of that character in its chief manifestations, and try to reach an explanation for the aspects in which it manifested itself and for which is has been most severely attacked.

The Fickle and Unreliable Antiochenes

Before studying the first set of charges against the people of Antioch, let us remember first what we have already said in the preceding chapters concerning the City of Antioch and its population. It was the capital of the Seleucids and later of the Roman East, yet it was an autonomous city. It enjoyed special privileges and the rulers showered on it all sorts of favors. Its people were a mixture of elements, identifying themselves with no particular race, nationality, or state. The Seleucids founded their city and made it their capital, but beside their loyalty to the Seleucids, the inhabitants were jealous of their autonomy and careful of their welfare. The Romans for them were strangers; they owed them loyalty as long as the Romans gave them a good and just rule. The army had one of its important centers near Antioch and sometimes associated with the population, yet it is not to be considered as a part of the population.

With these ideas in mind, let us see when and how the Antiochenes gave proof of fickleness. The story of dynastic struggles accompanied by court conspiracies and murders under the Seleucids since the middle of the second century B.C., is well-known.[1] The changes of rule from Demetrius I Soter (162-150 B.C.) to Alexander Balas (150-145 B.C.), and from Balas to Demetrius II Nicator (146-125 B.C.), and from him to Tryphon (145-142 B.C.), and then to Antiochus VII Sidetes (138-129 B.C.), and the arrival

---

[1]Appian xi. 65-70 gives a summary of these events.

of Alexander II Zabinas (128-123 B.C.) to the throne, were not the work of the people of Antioch. Alexander Balas was supported by Ptolemy VI Philometor of Egypt against Demetrius I and was married to Cleopatra, Ptolemy's daughter. The soldiers likewise supported Balas who became king, and Demetrius I was slain in battle.[1]

The same Ptolemy who had supported Balas withdrew his support and even his daughter and married her to Demetrius II who became king.[2] Diodorus tells us that Demetrius II became arrogant and unapproachable like his father Demetrius I, especially when he felt secure. He dismissed his army and favored the mercenaries who came from Crete; thus he incurred the hatred of the soldiers because other kings gave them money even in peace time.[3] Diodorus tells us, moreover, that he scorned the customary habit of pleasing the mob, became insolent and harsh, committed many injustices, and that Lasthenes, the commander of the Cretan mercenaries, imposed heavy punishments on the opponents of Demetrius II. When the Antiochenes rioted because of the harsh treatment, Demetrius brought mercenaries against them, and those who did not surrender, he caused to perish in the hands of the law or to be shot in their houses with their wives and children. When a riot took place, he burnt the biggest part of the city and took the property of those whom he considered responsible. Many Antiochenes, it seems, ran away through fear and hate watching a favorable occasion, while Demetrius continued his murders, banishments, and confiscations.[4]

---

[1]Josephus Antiquities xiii. 2. 35.

[2]Ibid. 4. 129.

[3]Diodorus in Excerpta Historica, II, Part I, 295; Josephus Antiquities xiii. 4. 129; 1 Maccabees 11:38.

[4]Diodorus in Excerpta Historica, II, Part I, 295.

Josephus informs us about that same riot in 145 B.C., in which the Antiochenes joined with the disappointed army, and which was severely quelled with the help of Jonathan and his three thousand Jewish soldiers.[1] Finally, a general of Balas called Tryphon, supported by the soldiers who had received no pay, defeated Demetrius II and obliged him to flee. Tryphon killed Antiochus VI the son of Balas, in whose name he had fought, and promised money to the soldiers if they elected him king, which they did. But he changed his mild nature, so the soldiers hated him and went over to Cleopatra, wife of Demetrius II, who sent for Antiochus, her husband's brother and married him. Tryphon was defeated and Antiochus reigned as Antiochus VII Sidetes.[2]

It is difficult, in view of this, to see how these dynastic changes could be the work of the Antiochenes, as certain modern historians have maintained.[3] In the long series of vicissitudes of the ruling house of Seleucus, the people of Antioch were more victims of events and disorders than their instigators. The changes we have just described were the work of the Ptolemies of Egypt and of the army. We must admit that the population was corrupted by favors, for the new kings trying to supersede each other, sought to be popular by pleasing the mob, as Diodorus says, and if the population became demoralized and used to the change of kings, it was the fault of the rulers.[4] The Antiochenes,

---

[1]Josephus Antiquities xiii. 5. 131.

[2]Ibid. xiii. 5. 140; xiii. 7. 218. Appian xi. 67-70 does not consider Balas, his son Alexander VI, and "their slave" Diodotus (Tryphon) kings.

[3]Hogarth, op. cit.; Bikerman, op. cit., p. 9; Kahrstedt, op. cit., p. 74.

[4]Diodorus in Excerpta Historica, II, Part I, 295 explains this complacency of new kings of rival lines and its effect on the people.

moreover, were the people of the capital, and were the most directly affected by disorders and inefficient rule; they rioted when the treatment of Demetrius II became too harsh. "Their right," as Bikerman puts it, "was of a sociological order, that of a capital."[1] One should not discount also the effect of the series of intrigues, scandals, and murders of all sorts, that lasted until the end of Seleucid rule, on the character of the population.[2]

Libanius has left a testimony, put in his usual rhetorical fashion, concerning the manner in which the City of Antioch took the change of Seleucid rule. "When the gods ended their rule," he said, "and surrounded everything by Roman rule as by a golden chain, the city attended to the heavenly decision and took the change without grumbling."[3] The fact is that the Antiochenes

---

[1]Bikerman, op. cit., p. 9. The reference of Bikerman to the people of Paris as a parallel is not totally exact, because the revolutions of France between 1789 and 1870 were the direct work of the people of Paris organized in parties, and the army played a very insignificant role. In Antioch, to which Bikerman tried to apply the state of things that occurred in Paris, the facts of the case were different, for the army played the first role.

[2]Justin xxxix. 2 ff. tells us that after Alexander Zabinas (128-123 B.C.) had been placed on the throne by Ptolemy VIII, he lost power because the same Ptolemy supported Antiochus VIII Grypus; when Zabinas was defeated, he came to Antioch and attempted to take the statue of Victory made of massive gold from the Temple of Jupiter; he was surprised in his sacrilege and had to run away. There were wars between Antiochus Grypus (125-95 B.C.) and his half-brother Antiochus IX Cyzicenus (116-95 B.C.) whose wives were sisters. Cleopatra, wife of Cyzicenus, was killed in the temple at the instigation of her sister Tryphene who was herself killed later by Cyzicenus. Appian xi. 68-69 speaks of Cleopatra, the wife of three successive kings (Balas, Demetrius II, and his brother Antiochus VII), who shot her son Seleucus V in 125 B.C., but her second son Grypus obliged her to drink the poison which she prepared for him. Grypus was driven from rule by Cyzicenus who was tyrannical and ended by being burnt to death in the gymnasium of Mopsuestia. Antiochus X Eusebes (94-83 B.C.) was expelled in 83 B.C. by Tigranes.

[3]Libanius Or. xi. 129: ἥσθετο τῆς ἐν οὐρανῷ βουλῆς, ἀψοφητὶ δὲ τὴν μεταβολὴν ἐδέξατο. One can almost be

were not sorry for the change of rule; they even worked to bring Tigranes at first,[1] and when the Seleucids came back to renew their quarrels, the Romans interfered with Pompey in 64 B.C., and Seleucid rule was ended.[2] But this should not be brought as a stigma against them,[3] for regular government was no more possible with the Seleucids; their worthlessness as rulers became too evident.[4] Syria had no more government, and Antioch was in a state of great insecurity.[5]

Roman rule did not always bring peace and security to Antioch especially during the period of civil wars in the second half of the first century B.C. For during these wars of Caesar against Pompey in 49 B.C., of the senate against Octavian and Antony in 44 B.C., and of Octavian against Antony in 31 B.C., the cities were bearing, besides taxes, the heavy burdens of

---

reminded of the god Marduk in the "cylinder of Cyrus" looking in all lands to find a ruler after his own heart, thus interfering, as lord of the gods, to end the rule of Nabonidus and give the power to Cyrus of Anshan. See Robert W. Rogers, Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament (New York, 1918), p. 380.

[1]Justin xl. 1. After the kings and the kingdom of Syria were exhausted by wars of brothers and their sons, the people began to look for relief from foreign parts; finally they called Tigranes and enjoyed a quiet reign.

[2]Justin xl. 2 says that Pompey refused the crown to Antiochus XIII Asiaticus set up by Lucullus. Appian xi. 49 says that Pompey annexed Syria for it was unnatural for the Seleucids whom Tigranes had dethroned to govern Syria rather than the Romans who had conquered Tigranes.

[3]Hogarth, op. cit., seems to bring it as a stigma against the Antiochenes when he says: "In 83 B.C., they turned against the weak Seleucids and opened the gates to Tigranes of Armenia; they tried to depose Antiochus XIII in 65 B.C., and petitioned Rome successfully against his restoration."

[4]Strabo xiv. 668.

[5]Dobiaš, op. cit., p. 550 says that Antiochus XIII was quarrelling with Philip II who came to Antioch in 67 B.C., then ran away, and anarchy was prevailing throughout Syria until Pompey interfered.

contributions, requisitions, and billeting of soldiers. The wars were foreign to them, and were fought for the ambitions of persons. This is the reason why the cities, including Antioch, had no sympathy with the contending parties.[1] They sided with one or the other side because it was nearer, and we should not accuse Antioch and the Antiochenes of fickleness if they received impartially the partisans of both sides. Moreover, the Parthians were a constant menace during these wars, and although they failed to take Antioch in 51 B.C.,[2] they succeeded in 41 B.C., while Antony was under the sway of his passion for Cleopatra and was selling the positions of authority in the cities,[3] in ruling Syria for two years under Pacorus and a Roman general called Labienus, of the party of Cassius and Brutus. This Labienus was originally sent to bring reenforcements from the Parthians against Octavian and Antony. When his party was defeated, he came with the Parthians to occupy Syria.[4] The event is significant, for if the Romans themselves were seeking the help of their common enemy, the Parthians, against each other, the Antiochenes and the Syrians, who were foreigners to both parties, could not be blamed for receiving one and the other side, when they really had no choice. The cities of Greece did the same; they heaped honors on the rulers of the day, mostly by flattery and adulation.[5] The Athenians went to the extent of betrothing Athena to Antony.[6] The people of Antioch did

---

[1]For details of these civil wars and the sufferings of the Hellenistic East during them, see Rostovtzeff, The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World, II, 983-1017. Caesar Civil Wars iii. 31 for the harshness of Pompey's administration in Syria.

[2]C. Dio xl. 28. [3]C. Dio xlviii. 24. [4]Ibid.

[5]Rostovtzeff, The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World, II, 990.

[6]C. Dio xlviii. 40.

not go to that extent,[1] and in this light the exaggeration of Renan on the servility of the Antiochenes becomes evident.

In the events of usurpation of imperial power under the Romans, we shall see to what extent the people of Antioch had a share, and to what degree we can accuse them of fickleness and of trying to subvert established order. In 175 A.D., Avidius Cassius, who was governor-general of the eastern provinces, proclaimed himself emperor against Marcus Aurelius, after his successful campaign against the Parthians.[2] It seems that the attempt was encouraged by Faustina, wife of Marcus Aurelius, because her husband was ill and her son Commodus was simple-minded.[3] Gallicanus tells us that the citizens of Antioch as well as some other states sided with him, and that Aurelius was angered at first at the citizens and took away their games and many distinctions and then he restored them.[4]

It is strange, however, that Cassius Dio in his detailed account of that usurpation does not mention Antioch nor the Antiochenes;[5] he simply says that when Aurelius came to the provinces which joined in the uprising of Cassius, he treated them very leniently.[6] He also gives a high testimony to the ability of Cassius saying: "He had shown himself an excellent man and the sort one would desire to have as emperor."[7] Thus, even if we

---

[1]Malalas, p. 212 says that Pompey took some statues of the gods to Rome by permission of the Antiochenes.

[2]C. Dio lxxi. 3. 1.

[3]C. Dio lxxii. 22; Gallicanus Avidius Cassius 7 in SHA.

[4]Gallicanus Avidius Cassius 7 in SHA; Capitolinus Marcus Antoninus 24 ff. in SHA.

[5]C. Dio lxxii. 17-29.

[6]C. Dio lxxii. 27.

[7]C. Dio lxxii. 22.

admit that the citizens of Antioch sided with Cassius, it seems that his recognition as emperor was by all the eastern provinces governed by him as far as Egypt, and evidently not only because they were under his rule and had no choice, but because he was a good ruler, and he curbed the indiscipline of the soldiers from whom the provincials, and particularly the people of the cities, suffered.[1]

Twenty years later, in 194, when Didius Julianus was proclaimed emperor at Rome by the soldiers who had slain Pertinax,[2] Pescennius Niger, ruler of Syria, was hailed emperor by the legions in Syria.[3] Septimius Severus aspired likewise to the throne and thus there were at one and the same time an emperor in Rome and two in the provinces. Spartianus makes it clear that when Niger was hailed by the legions in Syria, it was more out of aversion to Julianus than in rivalry of Severus. He mentions also that the people of Rome were rioting against Julianus, and that Niger was so favored in Rome that even the senators prayed for his success, while with showers of stones and general execrations the people shouted: "May the gods preserve him [Niger] as emperor and him as Augustus."[4] Herodian likewise tells us that Niger thought of seizing rule only after hearing the Roman people calling him and cursing Julianus.[5]

Of the share of the Antiochenes in Niger's attempt to

---

[1]Gallicanus Avidius Cassius 6 in SHA.

[2]Capitolinus Pertinax 11-14 in SHA; Spartianus Didius Julianus 2 in SHA.

[3]Spartianus Septimius Severus 6 in SHA; Spartianus P. Niger 2 in SHA.

[4]Spartianus P. Niger 2 in SHA.

[5]Herodian ii. 7. 4.

seize power, Spartianus tells us that they aided him with supplies;[1] Cassius Dio[2] and John of Antioch[3] do not mention Antioch at all, while Herodian says that Niger made a speech to the assembled troops and some crowds of people, and at the end of the speech they greeted him as emperor and Augustus.[4] Later he says that the forces of Niger were in great part out of the population of Antioch.[5] Herodian, moreover, in this connection speaks of the Syrians as light by nature and inclined to the renewal of existing things,[6] and he mentions a speech made by Severus to his Illyrian troops on his way to fight Niger, evidently to encourage them, saying: "The Syrians are people apt to poke fun at others and compose satires, especially those who live in Antioch."[7]

Whatever the reasons might be for these details given by Herodian and missing in the others and especially in Cassius Dio who was a contemporary like him, it is evident that each of the three contenders, Didius Julianus, Severus, and Niger was proclaimed emperor by his own soldiers, that Niger was as much acclaimed by the people of Rome as by the Syrians, and that the

---

[1]Spartianus Septimius Severus 9 in SHA.

[2]C. Dio lxxv. 7 ff. in his account on the battle between Niger and Severus, and the punishments inflicted by Severus on the followers of Niger does not mention Antioch.

[3]John of Antioch in Excerpta Historica, III, 90.

[4]Herodian ii. 8. 1-6.

[5]Herodian iii. 1. 4.

[6]Herodian ii. 7. 4: φύσει δε κοῦφον τὸ Σύρων ἔθνος ἐς καινοτομίαν τε τῶν καθεστηκότων ἐπιτήδειον.

[7]Herodian ii. 10. 6: ἐπὶ μὲν γὰρ τὸ χαριέντως καὶ μετὰ παιδιᾶς ἀποσκώψαι ἐπιτήδειοι Σύροι, καὶ μάλιστα οἱ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν οἰκοῦντες.

soldiers in Antioch and then the crowd did not acclaim him, and he himself did not think of seizing power, until the news came from Rome in his favor. In view of this, are we to call the Antiochenes fickle and disloyal and to say that they tried to raise Niger to the throne, when they responded to the general movement of making him emperor only after it had begun in Rome, although they were nearest to him and although he was known to be popular and mild?[1] And if we consider them fickle and disloyal, against whom was that disloyalty and fickleness displayed? Was it against Julianus who was execrated by the people of Rome and was acclaimed by a few hundred praetorian guards after they had slain Pertinax? Or against Severus who was equally a contender for the throne just like Niger? In this light one can see that Bouchier was not using the proper terms when he spoke of the "Oriental fickleness" displayed by the people of Antioch,[2] and that he was not telling the whole truth when he said: "Notwithstanding their ill success with Avidius Cassius, the Antiochenes made a second attempt . . . to foist a candidate of their own choosing on the Empire. . . ."[3] As for the young men of Antioch joining Niger's forces, it was only after Niger's proclamation went into effect, and it is to be viewed, not as an attempt to subvert established order, but as an aspect of rivalry between cities, as Herodian himself testifies; for Laodicea the rival of Antioch supported Severus, while Beyrut supported Niger in the same way as Antioch, because her rival Tyre supported Severus.[4]

---

[1]Herodian ii. 7-9 says that Niger was mild in rule to all and took part in their feasts.

[2]Bouchier, History of Antioch, p. 22; supra, p. 124.

[3]Bouchier, History of Antioch, p. 113.

[4]Herodian iii. 2. 7 speaks of riot and difference of

As for Herodian's and Severus' remarks on the lightness of the Syrians and their love of poking fun at others, they are to be viewed, like other remarks of the same sort made by Roman official persons or by those who represented their point of view, as an attempt to discredit the provincials whenever they try to do anything against either Rome or a person in power. Vopiscus gives us a remark of this same nature because the Palmyrenes revolted after their defeat by Aurelian, and killed the governor appointed by Rome with 600 bowmen; Vopiscus says: "It is a rare thing or rather a difficult thing for the Syrians to keep faith."[1] The same Vopiscus mentions a consul speaking in the Roman senate and saying: "The Syrians are so light-minded that rather than submit to our righteous rule, they desire even a woman [Zenobia] to reign over them."[2] Thus it becomes evident that, according to these historians, if the Syrians, and eventually all provincials, do not want to be considered light-minded, they should submit to Roman rule without any question!

The Antiochenes had no more sympathy for Zenobia than for the Roman emperors and rulers, and when the Palmyrene general Zabdas lost the battle in the vicinity of Antioch and fled to Emesa, Aurelian entered the city in 272 A.D., and was received

---

opinion arising in cities not as much by inclination to one of the contending emperors as by rivalry and quarrelsome spirit against each other; iii. 6. 9 on Antioch deprived of its privileges by Severus and made subject to Laodicea.

[1]Vopiscus of Syracuse Aurelian 31 in SHA: "rarum est ut Syri fidem servent, immo difficile."

[2]Vopiscus Tacitus 3 in SHA. The consul in question was showing the gravity of the situation and the necessity of choosing an emperor, because for six months after Aurelian's murder, the Roman senate was unable to choose an emperor until Tacitus was chosen.

with joy.[1] This should not surprise us, for Emesa itself, the nearest neighbor of Palmyra, and nearer to it in race than Antioch, did the same and Zabdas had to give it up because it chose the Romans.[2] Thus, let it be said once and for all, that all these struggles and rivalries of emperors, rulers, and dynasts were foreign to the cities and their peoples, and Antioch was one of these cities. It submitted to one or the other, either because he was nearer and it had no other choice, or because it saw that he would give more peace and prosperity and a more just rule.

The Satiric and Laughter-Loving Antiochenes

Testimonies on the satiric spirit of the people of Antioch are not lacking. Modern writers have spoken of their addiction to ridicule and scurrilous wit, and the invention of nicknames,[3] and have said that they were spirituels occupied with songs, parodies, squibs, and impertinence of all sorts.[4] We have referred to Septimius Severus speaking of them and of the Syrians in general as a people apt to poke fun at others and compose satires.[5] The Emperor Julian who suffered most from these traits of the Antiochenes, speaks of the people of Antioch in these terms:

> They are a laughter-loving people;[6] they have no respect at all for those who govern;[7] the atmosphere of the city is extremely independent even down to asses and camels, they are led even through the porticoes as though they were brides;[8] they insult their own sovereign, even the very hairs on his chin and the devices engraved on his coins.[9]

---

[1] Zosimus i. 51. [2] Zosimus 1. 54.

[3] Howson, op. cit.; supra, p. 124.

[4] Renan, The Apostles, p. 199; supra, p. 123.

[5] Herodian ii. 10. 6; supra, p. 134, n. 7.

[6] Julian Misopogon 345 D. [7] Ibid. 342 B.

[8] Ibid. 355 B. [9] Ibid. 356 A.

A brief study of the occasions in which these qualities manifested themselves will help explain why the Antiochenes were satiric and what caused them to lack respect for their kings and emperors when they did. We have seen already under the Seleucids that Alexander II was given the nickname Zabinas, "the bought one," either because he was son of a merchant or because he was placed on the throne by Ptolemy VIII of Egypt.[1] We do not know if the title Epimanes, the caricature of Epiphanes was given by them to Antiochus IV or by certain historians.[2] But the unusual behavior of that king described by Polybius[3] could earn for him such a title. Appian thinks that the title Pius (εὐσεβής) was given to Antiochus X by the Syrians by way of a joke, for he married Selene, wife of his father Antiochus IX and of his uncle Antiochus VIII.[4] We are not sure if these nicknames were given in a deliberate intention of insulting the kings. We must admit, however, that the nicknames were justified by the character of those to whom they were applied. Moreover, they could have been just the expression of a humorous, witty nature. And if we assume that the Antiochenes shared some traits common to both Syrians and Greeks, we can see easily that they had that "charm and facetious wit" which Eunapius attributes to Libanius, and that "charm and sweetness common to all Syro-Phoenicians" and equivalent to what

---

[1] Supra, p. 97.

[2] Polybius xxvi. 1 from Athenaeus x. 439a: "Polybius in his twenty-sixth book calls him Epimanes." We do not know how Morey, op. cit., p. 6 obtained his information when he said: "The people caricatured the name of Epiphanes and were wont to call him Epimanes."

[3] Polybius xxvi. 1 mentions his wanderings at night, visits to the baths, canvassing for office on the market place; xxx. 26-27 for his conduct during and after the festival at Daphne.

[4] Appian xi. 69.

the people in Attica call "keen scent or urbane wit" as Eunapius says.[1]

In Roman times we have a few instances where the Antiochenes ridiculed the emperors with whom they came in contact. Capitolinus tells us that Lucius Verus, co-emperor with Marcus Aurelius, sent to the East to fight the Parthians in 162 A.D., was an object of ridicule for the Syrians in general, because of his pleasures and riotous living in Antioch, while his generals were fighting; and many jibes they uttered against him on the stage were still preserved until the time of Capitolinus.[2] The fact is that Verus was so dissolute that Marcus Aurelius bewailed the fate of the empire; yet he was given the titles of Armeniacus, Parthicus, and Medicus for the victories which his generals had won.[3] His tutor Fronto wrote to him urging him to be sparing, temperate, and restrained in his desires,[4] yet it is strange that the same Fronto flatters him and compares him to Trajan, and speaks of his energy and of the discipline he gave to his soldiers,[5] when we know that once only he reached the Euphrates at the instances of his staff, and he soon returned to meet his wife.[6] One can see

---

[1]Eunapius Lives, pp. 523-524: καὶ ὅ πάντες οἱ Συροφοίνικες ἔχουσι κατὰ τὴν καινὴν ἔντευξιν ἡδὺ καὶ κεχαρισμένον, τοῦτο παρ' ἐκείνου λαβεῖν μετὰ παιδιᾶς ἔξεστιν. Οἱ οὖν Ἀττικοὶ μυκτῆρα καὶ ἀστεϊσμὸν αὐτὸ καλοῦσιν.

[2]Capitolinus Lucius Verus 7 in SHA.

[3]Ibid.

[4]Fronto Correspondence, ed. and trans. C. R. Haines, Loeb Classical Library (2 vols.; London: W. Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1919), II, 86.

[5]Ibid., II, 208.

[6]Capitolinus Lucius Verus 7 in SHA.

clearly here that the jibes of the Syrians were more true than the flattery of Fronto.

We have already referred to Alexander Severus who was annoyed by the jibes of the people of Antioch and others because they called him a Syrian synagogue chief and a high priest on the occasion of a certain feast.[1]

Coming to the notorious case of the Emperor Julian who stayed in Antioch in 362-363 on his way to fight the Persians, we know only too well how he was treated by the Antiochenes. Yet we know from Zosimus[2] and Ammianus[3] that when he neared the City of Antioch, he was received with public prayers and in a very friendly manner. Later on, Ammianus tells us that he was ridiculed as a Cercops, and as a dwarf spreading his narrow shoulders and displaying a billy-goat's beard, taking mighty steps as if he were the brother of Otus and Ephialtes; many called him a slaughterer (Victimarius) in jesting, alluding to his many offerings.[4] Julian, instead of punishing the Antiochenes, wrote a satire against them which he entitled Misopogon (the enemy of beards) leaving, according to Socrates, an indelible stigma upon the City of Antioch.[5] In reality the Misopogon is a satire on Julian himself in which

---

[1]Lampridius Severus Alexander 28 in SHA; supra, p. 118.

[2]Zosimus iii. 11. [3]Ammianus xxii. 9. 14.

[4]Ammianus xxii. 14. 3. Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, 2d series, II, 88, n. 2 refers to Gregory Nazianzen who called him "burner of bulls" (καυσίτορος).

[5]Socrates iii. 17: στίγματα δι᾽ ἐκείνην τῇ Ἀντιοχέων πόλει καταλιπεῖν . Zosimus iii. 11 who was a pagan favorable to Julian says that the Misopogon contained so much irony with bitterness that it was sufficient to spread the disgrace of the Antiochenes everywhere (... ὥστε πανταχοῦ γῆς ἤρκεσε τὰ Ἀντιοχέων ὀνείδη διηνεγκεῖν).

he scolded the people of Antioch.[1] For he describes how they insulted him and made fun of his beard as good for twisting ropes,[2] of his nails and hair seldom cut, and his fingers black from pen,[3] and how they annoyed him by alluding to Chi and Kappa, the first letters of Christ and of Constantine who reigned before him.[4] Julian made a sad picture of the character of the people, which provided many a modern writer with material on the insolence and dissoluteness of the Antiochenes. It is for this reason that we consider it necessary to know the circumstances of this important case between Julian and the people of Antioch.

Julian himself says that he incurred the people's displeasure because of his beard, his unkempt locks, his inattendance at the theatre, his reverence in the temples, his attendance at trials, and his attempt to banish greed from the market place by reducing prices.[5] We know that the reason for the people's displeasure was more than that. Let it be remembered in the first place that Julian turned pagan after Christianity had triumphed under Constantine,[6] and that, while the Christians were the majority in Antioch,[7] he was constantly visiting temples and offering sacrifices, so that sometimes one hundred oxen were killed at one

---

[1] The Works of the Emperor Julian, II, 272, n. 2.

[2] Misopogon 338 D.

[3] Ibid. 339 B.

[4] Ibid. 357.

[5] Ibid. 365 D.

[6] He even instructed in one of his letters that pagans should be preferred to Christians in public offices: Letter 37 in Works of Julian, III, 122; he also ordered that Christian teachers should not teach pagan authors: Letter 36, ibid., III, 116 ff.

[7] Malalas, p. 327 says: "The people of Antioch being ardent Christians loudly derided him." Pack, op. cit., p. 61, n. 1, refers to Misson in the Musée belge for 1920, p. 87 saying: " ... c'est contre la majorité chrétienne qu'avait été dirigé le Misopogon."

time; Ammianus who was of a good pagan family in Antioch,[1] attests that the soldiers gorged themselves with meat, lived boorishly, and drank heavily until they were carried through the squares to their lodgings on the shoulders of the passers-by from the public temples where they indulged in banquets that deserved punishment rather than indulgence.[2] In arguing cases during his attendance at trials, Ammianus tells us that Julian was sometimes untimely (intempestivus) asking what the religion of each of the litigants was.[3] We know that later on he accused the Christians of burning the Temple of Apollo at Daphne.[4]

Another reason for the people's displeasure was the fact that Julian reduced the prices to such a low scale, as Sozomen tells us, that the venders fled from the city, and scarcity ensued for which the people blamed the emperor.[5] Socrates tells us the same thing and blames Julian for not taking into account, when reducing the prices, how much the presence of any army lessens the supply; so that when the necessaries failed, the Antiochenes, being a people naturally impatient with insult (εὐρίπιστοι γὰρ οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἰς ὕβρεις) broke into invectives against him.[6] Ammianus, who was contemporary of the events, says that the measure was superfluous and had no satisfactory reason, but merely came from a desire for popularity; he adds that the senate clearly

---

[1]Thompson, op. cit., p. 2.

[2]Ammianus xxii. 12. 6.

[3]Ammianus xxii. 10. 1.

[4]Misopogon 361 C: ". . . whether by accident or in the purpose of hurling on the shrine of Apollo the fire which made the visitors of your city shudder, which gave pleasure to the mass of your citizens, and is still ignored by your senate." Naegele, op. cit., p. 37 for the Christian and the pagan points of view on the destruction of that temple.

[5]Sozomen v. 19.

[6]Socrates iii. 17.

pointed out that this could not be done at the time when he ordered it, but he called its members recalcitrant and stubborn.[1] Even if we make allowance for what Thompson says on Ammianus sympathizing with the senators and defending their profiteering activities,[2] the evidence from Sozomen and Socrates shows that the measure taken by Julian was one of the important causes for the displeasure of the Antiochenes. Ammianus, not only admits that Julian was fittingly criticized,[3] but speaking of the Misopogon, he says: "It enumerated in a hostile spirit the faults of the city including more than were justified."[4]

Those were the fundamental motives for the people's behavior with regard to Julian. When the news of his death reached Antioch a few months later, there was great rejoicing and festivity among the Christian population, and Theodoret tells us that dances were seen even in churches and oratories of martyrs.[5]

John of Antioch[6] and Suidas[7] have kept an account for us of the sarcasm with which the Antiochenes treated Jovian, Julian's successor. They received him with songs and parodies and well-known lampoons (ἀλλ' ἀπίσκωπτον αὐτὸν ᾠδαῖς καὶ παρῳδίαις καὶ τοῖς καλουμένοις φαμώσσοις). The main reason for this, it seems, was the peace treaty he signed with the Persians, which left to

---

[1]Ammianus xxii. 14. 1.

[2]Thompson, op. cit., pp. 2, 81.

[3]Ammianus xxii. 14. 3: "et culpabatur hinc opportune."

[4]Ammianus xxii. 14. 2: "Probra civitatis infenza mente dinumerans addens que veritati complura."

[5]Theodoret Ecclesiastical History iii. 22.

[6]John of Antioch in Excerpta Historica, II, Part II, 201.

[7]Suidas, op. cit., I, 999.

them among other cities that of Nisibis, and which Abbé De La Bléterie believes to be the most grievous and ignominious act ever done in Roman history.[1] The Chronicle of Edessa has left us a picture of the fugitives from Nisibis carrying with them even the remains of their bishop.[2] The Antiochenes were probably concerned about themselves lest Jovian should betray them too, and because their city became more exposed to the incursions of the Persians.[3]

Procopius mentions perhaps the last case in which the Antiochenes displayed their sarcastic spirit. When Chosroes was encamping near their walls in 540, "they heaped insults upon him from the battlements and taunted him with unseemly laughter," because he asked the payment of ten centenaria of gold.[4] Procopius adds that Chosroes, boiling with anger, decided to storm the wall. The result was the capture and destruction of the city. And thus, it is maintained that the jesting of the Antiochenes caused their destruction. But we are not sure that Chosroes might not have attempted to capture the city any way, and, moreover, the habit of exchanging insults on the walls of a besieged city was not new, and we believe that the people of Antioch did not invent it.

We must admit, however, that the Antiochenes had a witty, sarcastic disposition which broke forth into invectives when they had reason to criticize or protest. But whereas most of these manifestations of their keen wit and satiric spirit were justified

---

[1]Duncombe, op. cit., II, 294.

[2]Untersuchungen über die edessenische Chronik, ed. and trans. Ludwig Hallier (Leipzig, 1892), p. 41.

[3]John of Antioch in Excerpta Historica, II, Part II, 201.

[4]Procopius The History of the Wars ii. 8. 6. The centenarius is one hundred pounds.

and were displayed often against rulers who were foreign to them, we see the Roman populace on the other hand making fun of their own emperors, and sometimes the best, for less serious reasons. Suetonius tells us that when Vespasian, who had no fault except love of money, died, a leading actor of the mimes wore his mask and imitated his actions and words asking the procurators how much his funeral procession would cost, and when they answered ten million sesterces he said: "Give me one hundred thousand and fling me into the Tiber."[1] Tiberius was stigmatized in plays in a farce which was received with great applause; it contained allusions to certain aspects of his private life.[2] Pollio relates that during a procession made by Gallienus in Rome in 262 A.D., in which there were some Persian captives, some Romans were lamenting the Emperor Valerian, the father of Gallienus who was captured by the Persians and whom Gallienus had left unavenged, and others even approached the Persian captives, scrutinizing them and looking if they could find the emperor's father among them. It seems that Gallienus burnt those jesters alive; Pollio adds the comment: "for such is the Roman's love of a jest."[3]

The Riotous and Insurrection-Loving Antiochenes

The Antiochenes, under certain conditions, were not contented with expressing their dissatisfaction by jest, sarcasm, and satire; sometimes they rioted. We have mentioned already the riot against Demetrius II in which they were badly defeated.[4] In

---

[1]Suetonius Vespasian viii. 19.

[2]Suetonius Tiberius iii. 45.

[3]Pollio The Two Gallieni 9 in SHA.

[4]Supra, pp. 127-128.

this and their other riots, the causes must be sought, on the one hand in the oppressive policy of kings and rulers and the corruption of the administration, and on the other hand in the outbursts of passion between the factions in the circus, exploited by the mob and turned into religious strife.[1] The rulers acted sometimes out of personal selfish motives to encourage trouble instead of avoiding it, as we shall see.

The oppression and opportunism of Roman governors were encouraged, not only by their brief tenure of office, but by the fact that they depended more on imperial favor than on the good will of the provincials.[2] These governors were covetous and sought to make a colossal fortune in a short time, such as Gabienus in 54 B.C., who inflicted more injury than pirates, according to Cassius Dio, until the Syrians cried out.[3] Velleius Paterculus has spoken of one of these governors, Q. Varus in 6-4 B.C., in these terms, referring to Syria: "Rich it was when poor he arrived, poor it was when rich he left."[4] Juvenal at the end of the first century A.D., knew this very well, and exhorted the governors to curb their passion and greed and to have compassion on the impoverished provincials "whose bones had been sucked dry of marrow."[5]

Libanius was aware of the corruption caused by the rulers of his day, for the governors not only made agreements with their

---

[1] Supra, p. 64, n. 5 for riots between factions, later directed against the Jews.

[2] Pack, op. cit., p. 67.

[3] C. Dio xxxix. 59.

[4] Velleius Paterculus, Histoire romaine, ed. and trans. H. Hainsselin and H. Watelet (Paris: Classiques Garnier, 1932), ii. 17: "Pauper divitem ingressus, dives pauperem reliquit."

[5] Juvenal viii. 87: "Ossa vides rerum Vacnio exucta medullis."

satellites for enriching themselves,[1] but also corrupted the people and bought their services for their personal quarrels. Thus Lucianus the consular of Syria hired some people to acclaim him and curse Tatianus who sought to remove him in 388.[2] Sometimes the followers of the departing governor would pay the ringleaders and their hired men to cause a riot at the baths under pretext that the water was not heated enough, with the deliberate intention of causing trouble to the new governor.[3] In order to gain popularity, the usual practice of governors was to bribe the ringleaders and actors to acclaim them in the theatre.[4] Thus many seditions made by the Antiochene populace, were really the work of their rulers and their satellites. The mob that was paid to accomplish their wishes, lost respect for them and became an element of disorder. The intriguers came to besiege governors with petitions and threatened them with slander if they did not agree to their demands.[5] Julian himself seems to recognize the corruption and covetousness of emperors and Roman governors when he speaks for himself and his companions addressing the Antiochenes and saying:

> Not one of us bought a field or a garden in your city or built a house or married or fell in love with a handsome youth or coveted wealth or awarded court patronage; we did not induce the populace to make banquets and theatre shows; I have not loved gold or silver or increased the tribute.[6]

Among the causes of social disorders was the question of

---

[1]Libanius Or. ii. 42; Pack, op. cit., p. 52.

[2]Libanius Or. lvi. 16; Pack, op. cit., p. 56.

[3]Libanius Or. xxvi. 3; Pack, op. cit., p. 101. The case is that of Proculus and his successor Icarius in 384.

[4]Pack, op. cit., p. 115.

[5]Libanius Or. li. 4 ff. Pack, op. cit., p. 52.

[6]Julian Misopogon 365.

corn and other food supplies. The rich landowners played with prices as they wanted, and Julian tells us how he brought quantities of corn to Antioch to limit the prices by selling corn at a cheap price, but the rich people bought it and sold it at the price they wanted outside Antioch.[1] About a decade before Julian's arrival in Antioch, his half brother Caesar Gallus was ruling the whole East in 351 B.C. Ammianus gives us an account of a fierce riot that he deliberately caused against the consular governor Theophilus. For when the people of Antioch asked Caesar Gallus to save them from famine, he delivered up Theophilus, repeating that no one would lack food if the governor did not want it. The lower classes, driven by hunger and rage, assailed Theophilus, trampled him and tore him to pieces.[2] If Ammianus is not misrepresenting the facts, we have here another case of a riot occurring by open encouragement of a higher governor against a subordinate. Again, we are told that Gallus, who had some quarrels with the prefect and the quaestor in Antioch, ordered his troops to drag them bound by ropes at full speed through the streets of the city until their limbs and joints were torn asunder, and then they were mutilated and thrown into the river.[3] One wonders whether those who have written on the insolent, passionate, and insurrection-loving populace of Antioch have taken these facts into

---

[1] Ibid. 362 C; Thompson, op. cit., p. 61 says that the senators of Antioch "were not above dumping grain into the Orontes in a time of shortage if they could not obtain what they considered a fair price"; Ammianus xxvii. 3. 4 mentions a parallel for that in Rome when the Romans burnt the house of Symmachus because he was alleged to have said that he would rather use his wine for quenching lime kilns than sell it at the price the people hoped for.

[2] Ammianus xiv. 7. 5.

[3] Ammianus xiv. 7. 9.

consideration, or if otherwise they have mixed in the picture the rulers with the ruled, attributing to the subjects the bad traits of those who governed them.

The stay of Valens in Antioch witnessed a series of executions and tortures in 371, on charges of magic and treason.[1] Evidently there was so much discontent that the people were consulting oracles and magic to know the next emperor after Valens. The mass of the people was dissatisfied with the corruption of governors and with the prevailing social injustice. Libanius has described for us the unjust penal practices, the tortures, the venality of guards, the condition of the prisoners filthy, ragged, hungry, begging by day in the market place and giving what they could to their keepers, or making old women beg for them while comely women endured mistreatment.[2] The prisoner had to make a payment to the door-keeper (τῷ τῆς θύρας κυρίῳ) who provided a lamp for all, and oil at a price, and if he had no money he was lashed or his mother had to beg.[3] Ammianus describes the wickedness of judges and the ignorance of lawyers who knew only how to sow hatred;[4] he contrasts them with the Persians among whom upright men were chosen for the office of judge.[5] The farmers were also suffering from misery and bad treatment, especially those who were farm laborers.[6] Chrysostom describes their sufferings, their masters treating their bodies "like asses or

---

[1]Ammianus xxix. 1. 24 ff.

[2]Libanius Oration on the Prisoners xlv. 8 ff. Pack, op. cit., pp. 78-79.

[3]Libanius Or. xlv. 10. Pack, op. cit., p. 86.

[4]Ammianus xxx. 4. 1 ff. [5]Ammianus xxiii. 6. 82.

[6]There were two kinds of farmers: those who worked on big farms, owned by great landlords, in quality of laborers, and those who were tenants. Cf. Pack, op. cit., p. 27.

mules, or rather like stones . . . and whether the earth yields or not, they alike wear them out, and grant them no indulgence."[1]

To complete this sad picture of the existing conditions, one should not forget the arrogance and lawlessness of soldiers and officials. Chrysostom described the soldiers as committing sins every day, insulting, reviling, frantic, making profit of other people's calamities, "being like wolves never clear of offenses unless one might say the sea was without waves."[2] Just as in the case of Roman soldiers robbing the countryside and carrying from farm houses cattle and slaves and exchanging them with dealers for imported wine,[3] so the soldiers around Antioch were robbing, intimidating shopkeepers, conducting wild scenes in inns, and feasting at the expense of wine-sellers.[4] The soldiers were joined sometimes in their lawlessness by officials and "informers" (curiosi).[5] The soldiers and especially the military commanders often acted as "patrons" helping the insurgent farm laborers on big estates, or the tenant farmers in the villages against the attempt of the senators to collect taxes, exacting certain payments for their help. They used their influence with the judges against landowners.[6]

It was in this atmosphere of corruption and discontent

---

[1]Chrysostom Homilies on St. Matthew lxi. 3.

[2]Ibid. lxi. 2.

[3]Fronto, op. cit., II, 164 being excerpts from Sallust's Jugurtha. Tacitus Histories ii. 86 on the conduct of the German legions in Rome.

[4]Libanius Oration against Florentius xlvi. 10 ff.

[5]Ibid. xlvi. 15; Pack, op. cit., p. 19.

[6]Libanius Oration on the Patrons xlvii. 13 ff. Libanius complains bitterly about the patrons because they helped the farmers on his own estate.

that the sedition of 387 took place under Theodosius. Zosimus recognizes clearly that the revolt was a protest against injustice, lack of virtue, and luxury, and especially against the new increases of taxes.[1] New imposts were laid for celebrating the tenth year of Theodosius' reign and the fifth year of his son Arcadius as Augustus. The upper class lamented the announcement of excessive taxes with tears in their eyes when they approached the prefect, and implored divine assistance. When their request was not answered, the mob composed of strangers and adventurers[2] broke into deeds of violence in the baths, and threw out the statues of the emperor and his family and dragged them through the streets. The sedition was immediately put down. Sozomen tells us how the citizens' rage subsided after the sedition and gave place to repentance.[3] Chrysostom wrote a series of homilies to the people of Antioch, called Homilies on the Statues, to raise their morale, in view of the fear of the emperor's vengeance, and to implore imperial forgiveness.[4] This is not the place to tell

---

[1]Zosimus iv. 41: "As things became worse during the reign of Theodosius and no one arose to commend justice and virtue, and seeing every day every sort of luxury and extravagance increase, so the inhabitants of Antioch could no more bear that the collectors of the public taxes intend every day to make new increases, so they revolted."

[2]Supra, p. 58 on this rabble class. Chrysostom Homilies on St. Matthew xxxvii. 8, speaking of these strangers and low class adventurers who are hired by the governors or men of rank or actors to raise a cheer in the theatre says: "Those who cause tumults in cities and excite the populace in theatres are a source of lawlessness." Ausonius xi. 4-5 speaking of Antioch and Alexandria says: "Each is disordered with her mob and half crazed with the riots of her frantic populace" (Turbide vulgo utraque et amentis populi male sana tumultu).

[3]Sozomen vii. 23.

[4]Chrysostom Homilies on the Statues xiii. 2-6 describes the people running away from the city and seeking refuge in caves and secret places; the dignitaries loaded with chains, were sent to prison.

the story of how the emperor finally forgave the city after imposing on it some temporary punishments, but the significant fact is that this sedition and the few others that preceded it in the course of the history of Antioch, were not made because the people took pleasure in rioting, but because of oppression on the one hand, and direct or indirect encouragement by the rulers who corrupted the populace.

CHAPTER V

THE CHARACTER OF THE ANTIOCHENE POPULATION
THE SO-CALLED PLEASURE-LOVING AND DISSOLUTE CHARACTER OF THE ANTIOCHENES

We come now to the study of a different set of charges made against the people of Antioch where they are said to be lovers of spectacles, festivals, and frivolous entertainments in which they showed signs of dissoluteness and immorality.

Luxurious Living and Love of Feasts

One of the aspects of the pleasure-loving character attributed to the Antiochenes is their luxurious living and their love of feasts and banquets. Poseidonius of Apamea in the first century B.C., spoke of the Syrian cities in general and of their continuous feasting.[1] We have mentioned already Herodian who spoke in the third century A.D. of this aspect saying: "The Syrians are by nature lovers of feasts, especially those of them who live in Antioch, a great and rich city, feast almost throughout the whole year, partly in the city itself, partly in the suburbs."[2]

---

[1]Athenaeus xii. 527 f.; v. 210 f.; Poseidonius in Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum (referred to as F.H.G.), ed. Karl Müller (4 vols.; Paris, 1868-1874), III, 258: "The people in the cities, relieved of any distress because of the plenty which the land afforded used to hold many gatherings in which they feasted continually, using the gymnasia as if they were baths, anointing themselves with expensive oil and perfumes and living in the commons (τοῖς δὲ γραμματείοις) where the diners met, putting the greater part of the day there filling their bellies in the midst of wines and foods so abundant that they carried a great deal home with them."

[2]Herodian ii. 7. 9.

Julian, a century later, speaks for them in the first person saying: "We do not know what temperance is and we hear its name only."[1] Then he says concerning himself: "It happened to me most rarely of all men to vomit my food . . . and it was not due to overeating."[2] In the sixth century Procopius put in the mouth of Alamoundaros, an Arab chief, a speech addressed to the Persian King Cabades, encouraging him to invade Syria and Antioch saying: "And this city is unguarded and destitute of soldiers, for the people of this city care for nothing else than fêtes and luxurious living."[3]

We do not know the context of the statement made by Poseidonius and in what condition it was said, for it is a fragment; yet it makes no special mention of Antioch, and if the Antiochenes were particularly lovers of feasts, he would not have failed to mention it as Herodian did. From the circumstances in which the other three statements were made, we can see that they are of doubtful value or at least exaggerated. For Herodian was describing the advance of Severus against Niger in Syria and he wanted to say that the Syrians would not offer any great resistance to Severus. His words came in the same context as those of Severus addressing his soldiers and speaking in the same terms to sustain their courage. With the motives of Julian and the nature of his Misopogon we are already familiar. As for Procopius, his words said by Alamoundaros were a sort of encouragement for the Persian king to attack Antioch and the rest of Syria, and it was to his interest to exaggerate the weakness of the people and their inability to defend themselves; the events proved later that the

---

[1]Julian Misopogon 343A.

[2]Ibid. 340C.

[3]Procopius The History of the Wars i. 17. 37.

people offered a fierce resistance to the Persians while the Roman soldiers fled from the city.[1]

Let us look now for the facts and see what the contemporaries said about the feasts and luxury of the Antiochenes. Polybius says that whenever Antiochus Epiphanes heard that any of the young men were at an entertainment, he would come in quite unceremoniously with a fife and a procession of musicians.[2] Except for this casual mention of entertainments held by certain young men, we do not know much about banquets and processions given in Antioch in the Seleucid period except those given by the kings. Polybius has described the great festival held by Antiochus Epiphanes at Daphne in 167 B.C., which consisted of a procession, of games, and of banquets in which the king himself danced and acted with the burlesque players to the great shame of the guests.[3] Among the great dinner devotees, Athenaeus on the authority of Poseidonius, mentions Antiochus VII Sidetes and Antiochus VIII Grypus.[4] Antiochus VII is said to have held receptions daily to great crowds and allowed every one of the feasters to carry home uncarved meat of land and sea animals prepared whole, capable of filling a cart, with wreaths of myrrh and frankincense and matted fillets of gold as long as a man.[5] Grypus also held great receptions during the games at Daphne and made distributions of different kinds of meat, slaves, horses, and camels to diners.[6] We suppose that these receptions "held daily to great crowds" by Antiochus VII were in line with the "continual

---

[1] Ibid. ii. 8. 17.

[2] Polybius xxvi. 1.

[3] Polybius xxx. 25 ff.

[4] Athenaeus v. 210 d; xii. 540 b, c; Poseidonius in F.H.G., III, 257, 263.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Ibid.

feasting" in the Syrian cities, of which Poseidonius speaks, and both seem to be an exaggeration on his part, not only on account of their frequency, but of the presents given to the multitude of feasters. Antiochus IX also indulged in drunkenness and luxury according to Diodorus.[1]

In the Roman period, some Roman emperors rejoiced in festivals during their stay in Antioch. We have already referred to the luxury and riotous living of Lucius Verus, which made him an object of ridicule to the Syrians.[2] Macrinus, who proclaimed himself emperor after the murder of Caracalla in 217, spent his time at festivals without restraint with the Antiochenes until he was defeated by Elagabalus.[3] In the fourth century we have more information on the life of the people due to Chrysostom especially, but one must take into consideration that, as a church father, he is bound to exaggerate the aspects of social life while exhorting the people to simple living. Libanius mentions certain governors who drank a part of the day and whom revellers liked to have as company.[4]

Chrysostom mentions details about cooks and makers of sauces and soups and birds filled within with fish, and laws on the order of dishes.[5] He speaks of swarms of domestics and parasites and flatterers.[6] He refers to other aspects of luxury such as the horse's bridle spattered over with gold, seats and

---

[1]Diodorus, Excerpts from Bk. xxxiv, ed. Dindorf (Leipzig, 1826), IV, 148.

[2]Supra, p. 139; Capitolinus Lucius Verus 7 in SHA.

[3]John of Antioch in Excerpta Historica, III, 90.

[4]Libanius Or. xlv. 24.

[5]Chrysostom Homilies on St. Matthew lxx. 4.

[6]Chrysostom Homilies on Romans xvii. 4.

footstools of silver, horses with attendants and fan bearers, marbles and columns in the palaces shining with gold.[1] Concerning women, he mentions golden ornaments and the use of cosmetics and pigments, "the body looking unseemly, the lips stained, the mouth like a bear's mouth dyed with blood, the eyebrows blackened as with the smut of some kitchen vessel, the cheeks whitened with dust like the walls of the tombs."[2] Concerning marriage, he wonders with grief: "Who then, about to marry, inquires about the disposition and nurture of the damsel? No one, but straightway about money, possessions, and measures of property."[3] When speaking of the marriage ceremony and what accompanies it, he mentions dancing and flutes and drunkenness and revellings.[4]

All these aspects of luxury mentioned by Chrysostom and which apply undoubtedly to the rich class, which he believed to be one-tenth of the population,[5] have nothing surprising in a great metropolis with high ranking officials and a rich class of landowners and merchants.[6] As for the banquets and feasts given by kings and emperors, they should not lead us to the supposition that they were a result of an atmosphere of festivity and merry-making prevailing in Antioch. They were in line with similar and even more unusual banquets and feasts throughout all the great cities of the Hellenistic-Roman world. Ptolemy Philadelphus in the first half of the third century B.C., held a remarkable

---

[1] Ibid. xi. 6.

[2] Chrysostom Homilies on St. Matthew xxxi. 6.

[3] Ibid. lxxiii. 4.

[4] Chrysostom Homilies on I Corinthians xii. 11.

[5] Chrysostom Homilies on St. Matthew lxvi. 3.

[6] Supra, chapter I, sections on the political and economic importance of Antioch.

procession in the stadium of Alexandria which Callixenus of Rhodes has described in detail.[1] Hippolochus the Macedonian in his "banquet letter" to Lynceus the Samian described a magnificent banquet in Macedonia around 300 B.C.[2] Straton king of Sidon, according to Theopompus, overstepped all men in pleasure and luxury.[3] The Emperor Vitellius in the first century A.D., held three or four feasts a day in Rome, each costing four hundred thousand sesterces. In one dinner, two thousand fishes and seven thousand birds were served; Suetonius tells us that he did justice to each of these feasts by taking emetics.[4] Athenaeus gives long details on the luxury of the people of Colophon in Ionia in the fourth century B.C., on the extravagance of the Thessalians in food and clothing,[5] on the feasting in Syracuse, and the luxury of Sybaris in southern Italy.[6] He speaks at length of parasites and flatterers, numerous in Greece and Athens,[7] and Lucian consecrates a work to "the parasite" in Roman society.[8] In another work, although it is a satire, we see even the philosophers drinking and covetous by eating and accepting invitations to dinner.[9] The processions of Titus,[10]

---

[1]Athenaeus v. 196 a- 203 b.

[2]Athenaeus iii. 126 e; iv. 128-130.

[3]Athenaeus xii. 531.

[4]Suetonius Vitellius viii. 13.

[5]Athenaeus xii. 526-527 e.

[6]Athenaeus vi. 273.

[7]Athenaeus vi. 234d-248.

[8]Lucian The Parasite.

[9]Lucian The Carousal or The Lapiths.

[10]Josephus Jewish Wars vii. 5. 123-157.

Gallienus,[1] and Aurelian,[2] not to mention except a few in Rome, were as great as that of Epiphanes in Daphne.

As for women's luxury, Juvenal tells us that women in Rome went to see games with attendants, cushions, and a fair-haired girl to run their messages;[3] that dowry was looked after in a woman,[4] and that women even provided spikenard for their lovers.[5]

Nor should it be supposed that those luxuries came to the Roman Empire from Syria in spite of Juvenal's remark on the Syrian Orontes;[6] for Livy tells us that foreign luxury was introduced to Rome by the army of Asia after 187 B.C., when it saw the luxury of the Ionian cities, and long before the Romans ruled Syria.[7] On the other hand, Nicholas of Damascus said that Lucullus was the first man who led the way to the luxury of modern times in Rome, for he enjoyed the wealth of two kings, Mithridates and Tigranes, a little before the Roman conquest of Syria.[8] Lucius

---

[1]Pollio The Two Gallieni 8 in SHA.

[2]Vopiscus Aurelian 33 in SHA.

[3]Juvenal vi. 352.

[4]Juvenal vi. 136 ff. The Syrian-Roman law book speaks of slave girls and flocks of cattle in the dowry of a woman: Syrisch-Römisches Rechtsbuch, p. 86, article 81 of the Arabic version; it speaks officially of the agreement before marriage on what the man pays which is the ܦܪܢܝܐ Syriac مهر and what the parents give, the ܣܘܪܝܐ , ܐܝܩܪܐ , Arabic جهاز; see p. 80 of the Arabic version, p. 23 of Syriac London version. The same law speaks of the woman married by public procession and crowns and merrymaking from her father's to her husband's home بالشهرة والاكاليل واللعب من بيت ابيها الى منزل زوجها ibid., p. 81, art. 5 of the Arabic version.

[5]Juvenal vi. 464 ff.

[6]We have explained the probable sense in which Juvenal thought of the Syrian Orontes: supra, p. 82.

[7]Livy xxxix. 6.

[8]Athenaeus vi. 274.

Verus was already known for his license and riotous life before he started for Syria,[1] and on his way to the East, while the legions were being slaughtered in the Parthian war, he was traveling through Athens and Corinth accompanied by orchestras and singers and rejoicing in the cities of Pamphylia and Cilicia that were notorious as pleasure resorts.[2]

Licentiousness and Dissoluteness in the Institutions of Social Life

If then the luxurious living of the Antiochenes and their feasting and banqueting had nothing extraordinary, let us examine the testimonies of the contemporaries concerning their different entertainments and institutions of social life to see how licentious and dissolute they were.

Antioch had all the social institutions and public entertainments which were to be found in cities of the Greek type in the Hellenistic-Roman period. In fact, a city was unconceivable without a minimum of those institutions and entertainments. The building records in Malalas show their variety and the generosity of rulers in providing buildings for them.[3] The most common among these institutions were the baths.[4] In Seleucid times we hear of Epiphanes going to public baths with jars of the most precious

---

[1]Capitolinus Lucius Verus 4 in SHA.

[2]Capitolinus Lucius Verus 6 in SHA.

[3]Malalas, pp. 216 ff., especially on buildings by Roman emperors.

[4]Malalas tells us about baths built by Caesar, Agrippa, Tiberius, Caligula, Domitian, Trajan, Hadrian, M. Aurelius, Commodus, Septimius Severus, to mention only a part: see pp. 216, 222, 232, 243, 263, 275, 278, 282, 283, 294 respectively. Traces of some of these baths were found in the excavations of 1932: AOR, I, 5-21; Morey, op. cit., pp. 10, 12 on the traces of five baths in the island area with a plan of bath C.

ointment, to the great surprise of the people. It is told that one day he even had a huge jar of stacte poured over the head of a man who had remarked, "How lucky you are, you kings, to use such scents and smell so sweet!"[1] After the spectacles which accompanied the festival of Daphne under the same Epiphanes, it was allowed for those who chose to anoint themselves in the gymnasium with all sorts of ointments from gold jars: saffron (κροκίνῳ μύρῳ), cinnamon (κιννα μωμίνου), spikenard (ναρδίνου) in the first five days, and ointments of fenugreek (τήλινον), marjoram (ἀμαράκινον), and orris (ἴρινον) in the succeeding days.[2] Those ointments, if what Polybius tells us is true, were provided by the king for that unusual occasion.

The Antiochenes were so devoted to their baths, that when they were closed by Theodosius after the sedition of 387, they were distressed, as Chrysostom informs us.[3] On one occasion, Chrysostom agreed that "to be denied the use of the bath is a grievous matter,"[4] and he does not seem to consider the bath as an aspect of dissolute life; on another, however, he seems to speak in a different tone saying: "That the baths are shut up? Neither is this an intolerable hardship, that those who lead a soft, effeminate, and dissolute life, should be brought back, though unwillingly, to the love of true wisdom."[5] Julian, criticizing the Antiochenes, tells them: "Rather than righteousness, you prefer changes of raiment and warm baths and beds."[6] Yet the

---

[1]Polybius xxvi. 1. [2]Polybius xxx. 26.

[3]Chrysostom Homilies on the Statues xviii. 13: "You have not been as yet shut out of the bath for twenty days and you are distressed as if you have not bathed for a year."

[4]Chrysostom Homilies on the Statues xiv. 15.

[5]Ibid. xvii. 9. [6]Julian Misopogon 342 C.

bath seems to be a regular social institution, and contrary to what Chrysostom and Julian said, Fronto, the Roman rhetorician of the second century A.D., had admitted that "dining and bathing and anointing with oil and all functions of such a kind are obligations of the wise man."[1] The Ephesians, according to Philostratus, wanted to stone their governor on one occasion, because he did not warm their baths enough.[2] Moreover, we have no evidence of dissoluteness in the conduct of the Antiochenes at the baths, except the statement of an austere church father like Chrysostom for whom the act of going to the bath alone is an aspect of softness and dissoluteness. We do not know if there were baths for both sexes in Antioch, but in Rome we know that the emperors had to abolish mixed baths.[3]

The people of Antioch could enjoy spectacles of all kinds. The above-mentioned festival of Daphne in 167 B.C., was accompanied by games, gladiatorial shows, and beast fights which lasted for thirty days.[4] The spectacles, it is needless to say, were provided by rulers or distinguished citizens, and particularly by the senators. Epiphanes was the one who acquainted the Antiochenes with gladiatorial exhibitions in the Roman fashion;[5] Livy tells us that they were received at first with more terror than pleasure by

---

[1]Fronto, op. cit., II, 57, dated 162 A.D.

[2]Philostratus Life of Apollonius i. 16.

[3]Capitolinus Marcus Aurelius 23; Lampridius Severus Alexander 24 in SHA.

[4]Polybius xxx. 26: ἐπιτελεσθέντων δὲ τῶν ἀγώνων καὶ μονομαχιῶν καὶ κυνηγεσίων κατὰ τριακονθ' ἡμέρας.

[5]Epiphanes stayed at Rome as a hostage for thirteen years, and Dobiaš, op. cit., p. 546 speaks of him as "un souverain à demi romanisé."

men unused to such sights.[1] He brought gladiators from Rome until the young men were accustomed to these shows, and he began to find the necessary supply at home. Malalas says that Caesar erected a special place for gladiatorial shows (μονομάχιον) at Antioch.[2] Under Augustus, a rich citizen of Antioch called Sosibius provided funds for the celebration of athletic contests and musical and theatrical performances.[3] These contests and performances developed later into the Olympic Games under Commodus who built the Xystus and provided for the cost of the celebrations to be held every four years for forty-five days in July and August in honor of Olympian Zeus.[4] The games consisted of wrestling, running races, musical performances, exercises of the pancratium, boxing, chariot races, and tragical performances.[5] Didius Julianus built the Plethrum at Antioch,[6] and Diocletian later built a stadium in Daphne for the games which were so much honored that the dignitaries around him participated in them, and he himself is said to have assumed the office of alytarch.[7] One of the punishments inflicted by Severus on Antioch in 194 for its support of Niger was the removal of these games to a place in Cilicia, but they were restored to Antioch and Daphne under Caracalla.[8] The

---

[1] Livy xli. 20

[2] Malalas, p. 216.

[3] Ibid., p. 224.

[4] Ibid., p. 284.

[5] Ibid., p. 288.

[6] Ibid., p. 290.

[7] Ibid., p. 307.

[8] G. Downey, "Malalas on the History of Antioch under Severus and Caracalla," Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association, LXVIII (1937), 141-156, explains the vague passage of Malalas, p. 307, which implies a previous transfer of the ceremonies of crowning the victors to Quadrigas in Cilicia, by the punishment of Severus. When Malalas says that the games were first celebrated under Commodus in 260 of the era of Antioch, he was mistaken because it falls in 212 A.D. under Caracalla, and probably Malalas was referring to the restoration of the games under Caracalla.

games were such a common occurrence that the athletic vocabulary entered even into the language of churchmen.[1] Yet it is worthy of mention that in all the accounts of these games, we have no criticism of the behavior of the Antiochenes except what Libanius mentions concerning the increase in the quantity and quality of spectators, who came to include slaves, students, workmen, and lads coming with their fathers, thus increasing disorder and noise.[2] Libanius, it must be remembered, was a strict pagan sophist who believed that the games in honor of Olympian Zeus should have the sanctity of the mysteries, and silence should prevail in them, even in the most remarkable bouts.[3]

Some of the strong attacks against the Antiochenes were made in connection with their attendance at the circus and the theatre. They are made either by church fathers, or by Libanius becoming too strict in measure as he became old.[4] Libanius could not understand that a greater stir was aroused in the city by the defeat of a charioteer than by the sickness of its foremost rhetor.[5] Chrysostom, on the other hand, complains of those who have the passion of horse races and can say the name and race and country and bringing up of the horse with complete truth, and the years of his life and his energy of running and who will take victory from whom, but do not know the number of the epistles of St. Paul,

---

[1] P.OR, II, 219: John, Superior of the monastery of Beth Aphthonia, speaking of a certain ascetic, says: "a vigorous athlete, he entered courageously the stadium of monasticism." (ماحول وإنه الناسك سكاريا حصحاما حلا للصهيون ويزنهلا).

[2] Libanius Oration on the Plethrum x. 5 ff.

[3] Pack, op. cit., p. 62.

[4] Ibid., p. 2 says that one of the governors called him "the jabbering fool" (λῆρος).

[5] Libanius Or. xxxvi. 15; Pack, op. cit., p. 63.

or if they know, they could not tell to what cities they were sent.[1] As a parallel to these complaints of Libanius and Chrysostom, we can cite the case of Fronto, who says in a letter to a friend dated 161 A.D., that his hand is useless from severe pain, but he goes on to say: "In spite of the pain, however, I have been carried to the circus, for I am again seized by a passion for the games."[2] Thus, Fronto, the Roman rhetor and tutor of two emperors, sick and at the age of sixty-one,[3] was seized by a passion for the games and had to be carried to the circus. Not only this, but Lucius Verus, the co-emperor with Marcus Aurelius, living in Antioch within sight of the people, busied himself with gladiatorial bouts and hunting while his generals were fighting in Parthia.[4] He favored circus games and the green faction and went to the extent of making a statue for his green horse and built him a tomb.[5] The Roman Emperor Commodus, Lampridius tells us, engaged in galdiatorial fights 735 times.[6] The other emperors, if they were not gladiators or amateurs of horse races, at least gave costly entertainments in the theatre and in the circus. Fronto explains their policy and defends it when he says: "They knew that the people are held fast by two things above all, the corn dole and the shows (annona et spectaculis)[7] and that the

---

[1]Chrysostom In Illud Salutate Priscillam et Aquilam, in P.G., LI, 188.

[2]Fronto, op. cit., I, 308.

[3]Fronto was born in 100 A.D. He was the tutor of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus.

[4]Capitolinus Marcus Antonius 8 in SHA.

[5]Capitolinus Lucius Verus 3 in SHA.

[6]Lampridius Commodus 11 in SHA.

[7]Fronto, op. cit., II, 216; cf. Juvenal x. 81: panem et circenses.

success of a government depends on amusements as much as more serious things."[1]

When Chrysostom in the fourth century complains that all the city moves to the circus, leaving the households and the agoras empty, and that nothing keeps them from going, neither rain nor heat nor any discomfort, while in church they complain of heat and crowding,[2] with all the exaggeration this includes, it should be realized that the Antiochenes did simply what the people of other cities did, and that Antioch was no more a "city of races, games, dances, processions, and fêtes,"[3] than any other city of its rank and size. Already in the first century A.D., Apollonius of Tyana scolded the Alexandrians for their chariots and horses,[4] and when he saw the Athenians going in crowds to the theatre below the Acropolis to witness human slaughter and the buying of adulterers and burglars to make them fight with one another, he wrote to the Athenians that he was surprised that the goddess had not already left the Acropolis when they shed such blood under her eyes.[5] Juvenal at the end of that same century, deplored that the people of Rome who once bestowed commands, consulships, legions, and all else "now meddles no more and longs eagerly for just two things, bread and games."[6] Ammianus describes the people of Rome spending sleepless nights for anxiety on the result of the race,[7] or standing open-mouthed from sunrise till evening in sunshine and rain

---

[1]Fronto, op. cit., II, 216.

[2]Chrysostom De Anna iv. 1.

[3]Renan, The Apostles, p. 198.

[4]Philostratus Life of Apollonius v. 16.

[5]Ibid. iv. 22.

[6]Juvenal x. 81.

[7]Ammianus xxviii. 4. 28.

examining the good points and defects of charioteers and horses.[1] They even went to the extent of rioting against a good governor for the arrest of a charioteer.[2]

One of the reasons why the church fathers attacked the circus and the games in general, often in too strong terms,[3] was the fact that they associated them with paganism. Thus Severus of Antioch considers that each spectacle is devoted to one of the gods: "To Poseidon the spectacle of horses, to Ares that of wrestlers who combat alone, to Diana that of fighters with beasts, and to Dionysus the theatrical representations."[4] Chrysostom calls the theatre and the circus "Satan's pomps,"[5] and similarly the observance of days and incantations and omens.

Antioch was acquainted with the theatre and with actors, dancers, and singers since the early days of Seleucid rule. Athenaeus relates, on the authority of Hegesander of Delphi, that Herodas the reciter of mimes, and Archelaus the dancer were in great esteem at the court of Antiochus II (261-246 B.C.), while his father, Antiochus I, had made the sons of Sostratus, the flute player, members of his bodyguard.[6] Lucian, in the second century A.D., gives a testimony to the intelligence of the Antiochenes and their devotion to the pantomime;[7] he says: "Each individual is all

---

[1]Ammianus xiv. 6. 26.

[2]Ammianus xv. 7. 2.

[3]Severus Homily liv in P.OR, IV, 45 speaks of the hippodrome as "the temple of laughter or, to name it more properly, the house of the ardor of prostitution."

[4]Ibid., p. 48.

[5]Chrysostom Instructions to Catechumens ii. 5 in P.G., XLIX, 239: πομπὴ δὲ σατανικὴ ἐστι θέατρα καὶ ἱπποδρομίαι.

[6]Athenaeus i. 19. Hegesander was a historian of the second century B.C.

[7]Lucian, ed. Jacobitz. II, 166 ff.; Fowler, II, 238, n. 1, translates ὄρχησις "pantomime" in the sense of the ballet dancer

eyes and ears for the performance; not a word, not a gesture escapes them."[1] Libanius in his youth had written an apology in favor of actors; later he changed his mind and spoke of them as a people who brought everything to corruption, an ulcer which already had brought more than one family to the ground.[2] He admits that "the good name of Antioch was damaged everywhere by the licentiousness and beastly behaviour of this class."[3] He speaks of their low moral character and that they were dominated by a clique subservient to the comes and the consulares.[4] Libanius knows, on the other hand, that the theatre was patronized essentially by unsober householders, soldiers absent without leave, and slaves,[5] and that it was the haunt of idlers driven from their cities by the people whom they had injured, of patricides, and of apprentices fleeing their trade.[6]

Julian attacks the theatre with its shameless women, boys who in their beauty emulate women, and men who have their whole bodies shaved smoother than women.[7] He satirizes the people of Antioch who complained about the harshness of Julian because he

---

of imperial times dating from the Augustan age; the term ὄρχησις could be translated by "the dance" in a wider sense of the word.

[1]Lucian, ed. Jacobitz, II, 166: οἱ γὰρ Ἀντιοχεῖς εὐφυέστατε πόλις καὶ ὄρχησιν μάλιστα προσβεύουσα αὕτως ἐπιτηρεῖ τῶν λεγομένων καὶ τῶν γιγνομένων ἕκαστα, ὡς μηδένα μηδὲν αὐτῶν διαλανθάνειν.

[2]Baur, op. cit., I, 203.

[3]Libanius Oration to Timocrates xli. 9: πανταχοῦ τῆς γῆς ἡμῖν ἡ πόλις διαβέβληται διὰ τὴν τούτων ἀσέλγειαν καὶ βδελυρίαν.

[4]Libanius Or. xli. 9; Pack, op. cit., pp. 63, 112.

[5]Libanius Or. xxvi. 8.

[6]Libanius Or. xli. 6.

[7]Julian Misopogon 345 D.

ruined their city by ignoring the stage and mimes and dancers for seven months,[1] and he refers to his predecessor, Constantius, who employed people to govern the mimes and the chariot drivers.[2] Then he gives the exaggerated statement regarding Antioch where "there are numerous dancers and flute players (ὀρχησταὶ καὶ αὐληταί), and more mimes than ordinary citizens" (μίμοι δὲ πλείους τῶν πολιτῶν).[3] Zosimus, as a pagan historian defending Julian, says:

> The Antiochenes being lovers of shows by nature and devoted to luxury rather than to serious occupations, were not pleased by the emperor's severity and wisdom; for he kept away from the theatre and rarely went to it, and when he went, he did not stay the whole day.[4]

The church fathers attacked the theatre and were much concerned about the dangers that beset those who attended it. Chrysostom speaks of the "satanical cries and devilish gestures . . . the foul sayings and gestures fouler, the dressing of the hair, the gait, the apparel and voice and flexure of the limbs and turning of the eyes."[5] Severus of Antioch explains the effect of the theatre on character, and refers to the erotic songs teaching dissoluteness, and adds: "After you see such spectacles and laugh, how could you look at your wife at home? How would you require chastity from her?"[6] Chrysostom had the same kind of concern. When the Emperor Theodosius closed the theatre after the

---

[1] Ibid. 344 A.

[2] Ibid. 339 D.

[3] Ibid. 342 B.

[4] Zosimus iii. 11: φιλοθεάμων δὲ ὢν φύσει, καὶ τρυφῇ μᾶλλον ἢ πράξεσι σπουδαίαις ἐκδιδόμενος ....

[5] Chrysostom Homilies on St. Matthew xxxvii. 8.

[6] Severus Homily liv in P.OR, IV, 54.

sedition of 387, and forbade the use of the hippodrome, Chrysostom was happy and exclaimed regarding these "fountains of iniquity," saying: "May they never again be opened!"[1] He also refers to the rulers attracting the mob by these shows saying: "They make the whole people sit on high and so they captivate their city."[2] Fronto himself acknowledges that when Trajan and Lucius Verus sent for actors from Rome to Syria, their action was based on the "loftiest principles of political wisdom."[3]

It has been admitted that the mime not seldom rose in its coarse realism to massive obscenity, but it seems that in the fourth century it became serious, and B. H. Reich reproaches Chrysostom for slinging his invectives against the mime, flourishing in beauty and splendor in Antioch and Constantinople, and considers it the last fighter in the struggle of Hellenism against Christianity.[4] Yet it is noteworthy that Julian, who was a great defender of Hellenism and paganism, attacked the theatre and the mimes and was indignant that Heracles and Dionysus should be dragged on the stage by comedians to make a public show of them.[5]

In all cases, we see that the promotion of theatrical performances and other spectacles was done by monarchs and rulers. Our evidence shows also that the attacks were made more against the institution of the theatre and its actors than against the people, and thus it becomes necessary to make a distinction between the moral standard of the theatrical class on the one hand, and

---

[1]Chrysostom Homilies on the Statues xvii. 9.

[2]Chrysostom Homilies on I Corinthians xii. 10.

[3]Fronto, op. cit., II, 214.

[4]Baur, op. cit., I, 203, referring to B. H. Reich in his book, Der Mimus, p. 201.

[5]Julian Misopogon 366.

that of the people. Even those who attended the theatre, if we believe the words of Libanius, do not seem to represent except a special fraction of the population. The dangers of the theatre were magnified by the church fathers, but the description of its evil influence in that exaggerated way does not mean that they were admitting the dissoluteness of the people. The fact that during the Persians' attack on Antioch in 260 A.D., the people were in the theatre,[1] which has been exploited by some modern writers,[2] need not reflect on the passion of the people for pleasure. Ammianus himself who relates the fact does not seem to draw any inference from it, for the Persians were a constant menace, and if their unexpected attack surprised the people in the theatre, we believe that the event reflects more on the weakness and corruption of the Roman administration than on the passion of the people for pleasure, as Mommsen said. Those who drew a similar inference on the character of the population from the unexpected arrival of Aurelian to Antioch in 272 A.D., while it was having chariot races are even more naive.[3]

---

[1]Ammianus xxiii. 5. 3.

[2]Mommsen, op. cit., II, 132: "The passion for pleasure is shown by the fact that the capture of Antioch by the Persians in 260 A.D. surprised the burgesses in the theatre."

[3]Zosimus i. 61 says literally: "Aurelian hearing news again from Palmyra on his way to Rome, came back quickly. He entered Antioch while it was having chariot races and he was unexpected by the people who were amazed and then he went to Palmyra." (καταλαβὼν δὲ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν καὶ ἵππων ἁμίλλης ἐπιτελουμένης τῷ δήμῳ φανεὶς καὶ τῷ ἀδοκήτῳ πάντας ἐκπλήξας ἐπὶ τὴν Παλμύραν ἤλαυνεν .) Bouchier, History of Antioch, p. 124, gives the statement an ironic touch saying: ". . . and his unexpected arrival while the citizens were absorbed in watching their favourite chariot races caused great commotion."

The history of Antioch, moreover, does not show any privileged treatment accorded to actors of the type which Ammianus mentions concerning Rome; for during a period of scarcity of food in 383, all foreigners were thrust out of Rome, while three thousand dancing girls with their choruses and an equal number of dancing masters were allowed to remain.[1] On the other hand, the Syrian-Roman law made by Constantine, Theodosius, and Leo makes it evident that men and women who serve in the different performances as the theatre, circus, and stadium, including mimes, actresses, and charioteers, are all considered honorless (صيحذنع) and cannot be made to inherit.[2] It is a clear sign of conservatism in the character of the society of that age in at least what relates to the theatrical class, and shows indirectly the gross exaggeration of Julian when he said that there were more mimes than ordinary citizens in Antioch.

Among the festivals of the Antiochenes, besides the Olympic festival already mentioned, two are especially outstanding: the Kalendas, and the Maiouma festivals. The Kalendas or New Year festival was known throughout the whole Roman world.[3] It lasted until Christian times and was attended with great festivities, meals, drunkenness, singing, dancing, playing dice, and jesting,

---

[1]Ammianus xiv. 6. 19 refers to this event to illustrate the stage of baseness reached in Rome.

[2]Syrisch-Römisches Rechtsbuch, op. cit., p. 7, art. 9 of the Syriac London version:

[3]Albert Müller, "Die Neujahrsfeier in römischen Kaiserreiche," Philologus, LXVIII (1909), 464-487.

especially during the night of the New Year.[1] Chrysostom refers to the diabolic amusements all night, jesting and railing, evening dancing captivating the city more dangerously than the enemy, dissoluteness because men and women drank unmixed wine until the morning, and impiety because they made their happiness throughout the year depend on their joy during the first day.[2] Libanius wrote a special oration for this festival which he, as well as Julian, held in great honor.[3] The church reacted against this festival of the god Janus and exhorted the people to stay at home, to give alms, and to fast instead of feasting and drinking. In the sixth century, the church instituted the first of January as a day of repentance and prayer, but in spite of that, the pagan survivals have remained among Christians even until the present time.[4] Nowhere do we find the Antiochenes' behavior considered dissolute except by Chrysostom who meant to mark the reaction of the church against a pagan survival; for the people of Antioch did not differ in their festivities on that day from the other inhabitants of the empire,[5] and even though the parallel is distant, they were probably not more dissolute on that occasion than the people of our own time.

As for the Maiouma which was a survival of Oriental paganism, it was celebrated in the month of May and was accompanied by

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 482 ff.

[2] Chrysostom Homily on Kalendas in P.G., XLVIII, 953.

[3] Libanius Oration on Kalendas ix. 13; Julian Misopogon 339 C.

[4] A. Müller, op. cit., p. 485.

[5] Ibid., pp. 477-484. Lucian describes the Roman festivities of the Saturnalia, old feast of the god Saturn, which lasted for a whole week in December: see Lucian Saturnalia, trans. Fowler, IV, 236 ff.

banquets and aquatic feasts.[1] Julian reproached the senators of Antioch because on the feast of Apollo not a single bird was given, while large sums of money were squandered on dinners in this feast.[2] Malalas tells us that the Emperor Commodus approriated an amount of gold for "the theatrical night feast, the so-called ὀργίων which is the feast of the mysteries of Dionysus and Aphrodite, the so-called Maiouma."[3] What the festival consisted of exactly, is unknown. Chrysostom probably refers to it when he speaks of going to the theatre to see women swimming and adds: "You go your way to the fountain of the devil to see a harlot swim . . . that water is a sea of lasciviousness."[4]

The Romans celebrated a similar festival at Ostia in the month of May and indulged in voluptuous practices, throwing one another in the sea.[5] It is strange that Julian who did not miss

---

[1]W. Drexler, "Maioumas," Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie, ed. W. H. Roscher, Vol. II, Part II (Leipzig, 1894-1897), 2286 recognizes that we are little informed about this festival. He refers to different authorities suggesting Maiouma, the port of Gaza, as the original place of the feast, and that its name was not derived from the month of May but it meant "water of the sea." Cumont, Fouilles, pp. 189 ff., refers to its celebration in Gerasa and possibly Doura. C. Clermont-Ganneau, Recueil d'archéologie orientale (Paris, 1901), IV, 276 mentions the reference to it in the mosaic map of Madaba.

[2]Julian Misopogon 361 D, 362 D.

[3]Malalas, p. 284.

[4]Chrysostom Homilies on St. Matthew vii. 7.

[5]Suidas, op. cit., II, 663. W. Drexler, op. cit., p. 2286 refers to Suidas calling the feast of Ostia Maioumas, as a possible error on Suidas' part because of its similarity to the Oriental feast; he suggests also that it could have come from Gaza to Ostia through commerce. Cumont, Religions orientales, p. 102, speaking of the feast at Ostia, refers also to the worship at Rome of Marnas, the god of rain, who was worshipped at Gaza. Cumont, Fouilles, p. 189, n. 6, suggests that the festival at Ostia might be a combination of the Syrian festival and of an old Latin festival.

an occasion to attack the Antiochenes, did not mention the dissoluteness that accompanied this festival, and yet some modern writers, taking the one-sided and brief statement of Chrysostom, exploit it to the greatest extent and give it the strongest emphasis.[1] It is possible that the aquatic games in this festival, consisting of swimming or bathing and plunging,[2] were originally ritual acts from which purification was expected.[3]

A good part of the reputation of dissoluteness and lasciviousness attached to the Antiochenes was due to the suburb of Daphne, which even some modern scholars do not find other words to describe except the naive and commonplace expression "the resort of the idle and dissolute."[4] That Daphne was a pleasure resort for Seleucid and Roman Antioch and a center of luxury, is beyond doubt. But a pleasure resort need not be always dissolute, nor those who spend some time in it. We have already mentioned the great festival held by Epiphanes in 167 B.C. in Daphne, and the Olympic Games celebrated in it after Diocletian. When Strabo wrote about it, he mentioned the grove, the fountain streams, and the Temple of Apollo and added simply: "Here it is the custom for the Antiochenes and neighboring peoples to hold a general festival."[5]

---

[1]Renan, Les apôtres, pp. 220 f., says: " ... à la célèbre fête de la Maïouma des troupes de courtisanes nageaient en public dans des bassins remplis d'une eau limpide. C'était comme un enivrement ... où se déroulaient pêle-mêle toutes les voluptés, toutes les débauches, n'excluant pas certaines délicatesses."

[2]We do not know even where the festival was celebrated; Schultze, op. cit., p. 163, says that it began on the Orontes banks. Cumont, Fouilles, p. 189, says that it was rather celebrated in Daphne where the water is abundant.

[3]Cumont, Fouilles, p. 189.

[4]C. R. Haines in Correspondence of Fronto, II, 306, n. 1; the translator was supposed to explain what Daphne was because it occurred in the text of Fronto; that was the way he identified Daphne!

[5]Strabo xvi. 750.

The Chronicle of Malalas does not give us any details on the dissoluteness of Daphne, and it refers to it on one occasion as the "sacred Daphne" (τὴν ἱερὰν Δάφνην).[1] When Marcus Aurelius spoke of the soldiers "living in luxury and conducting themselves in the morals of Daphne,"[2] he probably meant that they were becoming luxurious and dissipated in a way unbecoming the strict discipline of military life; and this is the reason why Avidius Cassius, commander of the Syrian legions, proclaimed that if anyone was discovered at Daphne in his uniform, he would return without it.[3]

When Severus of Antioch exhorts women, saying: "If your husbands push you towards the pleasure of passion, towards the frequented ways leading to Daphne, toward the humid and extravagant life of this place, fix your intelligence on St. Mary and the sacred books,"[4] we should view his exhortation in the same light as that in which we view the other writings of the church fathers who magnify the dangers of luxury because it might lead to sin, and who, on the other hand, view many aspects of social life as remnants of paganism and react strongly against them. Daphne was associated with Apollo, and Severus himself speaks of Apollo as "our neighbor that perverse who is in Daphne."[5] Sozomen, as a Christian writer, goes to the same exaggeration, explaining in a naive fashion that the fable of Apollo and Daphne itself, being

---

[1]Malalas, p. 278.

[2]Gallicanus Avidius Cassius 5 in SHA.

[3]Ibid. 6 in SHA.

[4]Severus Homily lxiii in P.OR, VIII, 306.

[5]Severus Homily cix in P.OR, XXV, 776: محط وبلح
هنا الحطا وحبط.

erotic, afforded an impulse and redoubled the passion among corrupt youths. He pretends that "men of grave temperament considered it disgraceful to approach this suburb and anyone who dwelt at Daphne without a mistress was regarded as ungracious and was shunned as an abominable and abhorrent thing."[1] This statement is unique in its mention of the "qualifications" required for living in Daphne, and it has afforded a basis for the statements that spoke of Daphne as a "resort of the idle and dissolute." The fact is, however, that some men of no less grave temperament than the philosopher Iamblichus lived in Daphne until their death,[2] and that when Arsane, the wife of the Persian king was taken as prisoner under Diocletian, Maximianus made her live in Daphne with honor until she was returned to her husband.[3] The thing to remember is that the rhythm of life in any resort, be it Daphne or any other, cannot be a normal one, and that in Daphne, the wealth of Antioch and the luxurious life of the Seleucid kings and Roman rulers were bound to manifest themselves in some kind of extravagance which need not necessarily reflect on the character of the entire people in the neighboring capital.

Effeminacy and Immorality

When Julian attacked the Antiochenes who ridiculed his beard, he told them in the ironic style of his Misopogon that he would provide them with ropes (twisted from his beard) if only they had the strength to pull them and their roughness does not do damage to their tender hands.[4] In that same satire, he said that, as descendants of Antiochus, son of Seleucus, one would not be angry with them if they emulate him in immorality, for he loved

---

[1] Sozomen v. 19

[2] Malalas, p. 312.

[3] Malalas, p. 308.

[4] Julian Misopogon 338 D.

and then married his stepmother.[1] Still, Julian tells the Antiochenes with the same spirit of irony: "All of you are handsome and tall and smooth-skinned and beardless."[2] Chrysostom, on one occasion, told the people of Antioch ". . . but in the competition of chastity, you are not ashamed to be behind the rudest cities."[3] In modern times, Gibbon made echo to Julian's attacks and spoke of the Antiochenes as "effeminate Orientals."[4] Mommsen considered that "all the great cities of the Roman Empire doubtless vied with each other in dissoluteness of morals, but in this the palm probably belongs to Antioch."[5]

We are already acquainted with the circumstances in which the Misopogon was written and with the purpose behind Chrysostom's homilies. Yet, to do justice to their charges, we shall examine briefly the facts and see to what extent they were true. A series of testimonies gives us the certitude that the Antiochenes were neither more effeminate, nor more immoral than the people in Greece and Rome. In fact, they were even less. Without referring to what Athenaeus relates about the effeminacy of the Sybarites,[6] which could be a humorous exaggeration, Lucian in the second century A.D., mentions a man in Rome, "one of those fellows who have their legs depilated and their beards shaved off . . . with rouged cheeks and underlined eyelids."[7] Suetonius tells us that Augustus used to singe his legs with red hot nutshells to make the hair

---

[1] Ibid. 348 B. [2] Ibid. 342 C.

[3] Chrysostom Homilies on St. Matthew vii. 7.

[4] Supra, p. 123. [5] Mommsen, op. cit., II, 133.

[6] Athenaeus xii. 518, on the authority of Timaeus, says that a man of Sybaris saw farmers digging in the country and he told his friend that the sight had given him a rupture; one of those who heard him answered, "listening to your story has given me also a pain in my side."

[7] Lucian On Salaried Posts in Great Houses 33.

grow softer,[1] and Capitolinus says with respect to Lucius Verus that he was proud of his yellow hair and he used to sift gold dust into it to make it brighter.[2] Athenaeus gives us details about the different manners in which men depilated their bodies among the barbarians in the west, and among the Greeks of Italy and Greece.[3]

As for vice and immorality in general, the Roman historians themselves give us the proof about the degree they reached in Rome. Tacitus mentions that under Tiberius bounds were set to female profligacy by stringent regulations of the senate, for a certain Vestilia, of a praetorian family, had advertised her venality on the aedile's list.[4] Licentiousness so flourished without restraint in Rome under Vespasian, that he induced the senate to make a law for curbing it.[5] The virtue of Antiochene women described by the religious writers themselves shows a totally different picture. The account of Eusebius concerning a wealthy woman of Antioch under Diocletian who drowned herself in the river with her two daughters when they were caught by soldiers, fearing about their chastity,[6] is in line with what we can

---

[1]Suetonius Augustus ii. 68.

[2]Capitolinus Lucius Verus 10 in SHA.

[3]Athenaeus xii. 517.

[4]Tacitus Annals ii. 85. The resolution was passed by the senate that no woman should trade in her body if her father, grandfather, or husband had been a Roman knight.

[5]Suetonius Vespasian viii. 11. The law said: "Any woman who formed a connection with the slave of another person should herself be treated as a bond woman."

[6]Eusebius of Caesarea Ecclesiastical History viii. 12 trans. Rev. A. C. McGiffert, Vol. I of the Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, 2d series, ed. Philip Schaff and H. Wace (New York, 1904), p. 332.

understand from Chrysostom's description of the hard times in Antioch after the sedition of 387. Chrysostom, relating with grief that a mother and a sister of a person who was being tried inside the tribunal were sitting in the vestibule of the court, adds: "No maid servant, nor neighbor, nor female friend, nor any other relative accompanied them, but they were alone." (οὔτε θεραπαινὶς, οὔτε γείτων, οὔτε φίλη... ἀλλὰ μόναι .)[1] One can infer that Chrysostom's grief at seeing "matrons and virgins wont to live in seclusion, become a common spectacle to all," as he says later on,[2] means that women in Antioch were held under strict social rules and that the standard of virtue expected of them was fairly high.

We do not need to go into details on the vices of Roman emperors and empresses,[3] part of which could be mere gossip; but the picture in Greece was not better. The number of courtesans who came from Athens in the Hellenistic age is a proof of lax morals in that city.[4] Athenaeus tells us that Athenian flatterers even made statues and shrines to the mistresses and parasites of

---

[1]Chrysostom Homilies on the Statues xiii. 3 in P.G. XLIX, 137.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Suetonius Augustus ii. 65; the two Julias, daughter and granddaughter of Augustus, were guilty of every form of vice and he had to banish them; Nero vi. 27: booths were set up at intervals along the banks of the Tiber for debauchery when Nero went down the Tiber to Ostia; Capitolinus Lucius Verus 10: there was gossip that Verus violated his mother-in-law, Faustina, wife of Marcus Aurelius, and that she killed him because he betrayed her to his wife, Lucilla; Juvenal vi. 114-132: the wife of the Emperor Claudius was wont to issue forth as a harlot in disguise, when her husband was asleep, and go to a brothel to receive all comers. These are only a few examples.

[4]Athenaeus xiii. 583; Ferguson, op. cit., pp. 70, 90 speaks of Athens under Demetrius of Phalerum with brothels on side streets, panders, and procuresses; the people of the best families were in debauchery, the old men, fathers, and mothers conniving at the intrigues of their sons.

Demetrius Poliorcetes.[1] As for the passion for boys, although it could have existed in Antioch, we do not have clear and direct evidence for its existence. In Rome and in Greece, evidence shows that this vice was widespread. The proofs are furnished not only by the obscene poems of Strato of Sardis,[2] and by Juvenal's satires,[3] but by accounts of writers[4] and historians.[5] Ammianus in the fourth century was aware that his readers will see, when he speaks of Rome, that he tells nothing but dissensions, taverns, and similar vulgarities. "The senators in Rome," he said, "descended to vice and sin and wantonness,"[6] and a certain prefect called Olybrius spent his time in playhouses and love affairs.[7]

One should not forget, in studying these charges of effeminacy and immorality, that the soldiers stationed around Antioch were responsible for a great part. Kings, emperors, and governors had demoralized the soldiers by their favors and were unable to curb their indiscipline. Antiochus III, supporting the burden of a great war against the Romans in Thessaly in 191 B.C., fell in love with a pretty girl after withdrawing from the siege of Larissa, gave a public festival to his army, and allowed it to spend the whole winter in idleness, so that in the spring it was

---

[1]Athenaeus vi. 252, 254. [2]Greek Anthology xii. 175 ff.

[3]Juvenal Bk. ix entirely on the trade of men.

[4]Lucian The Lapiths 15; Athenaeus xiii. 606: story of a pilgrim conceiving a passion for a lad carved in stone at Delphi, locking himself up with it, and leaving a wreath behind as a price of the intercourse.

[5]Suetonius Augustus ii. 68: Mark Antony taunted Octavian that he earned adoption by his uncle Caesar through unnatural relations; Nero vi. 27: Nero abusing free born boys, seducing married women, and debauching a vestal virgin. Spartianus Hadrian 14 says that when Hadrian lost Antinous his favorite youth in Egypt, he wept for him like a woman and the Greeks deified him at Hadrian's request. These are only a few examples.

[6]Ammianus xiv. 6. 2-7. [7]Ammianus xxviii. 4. 1.

found unfit for military duties.[1] We are familiar with the dynastic struggles under the Seleucids and how the different contenders for the throne promised favors to the army in case they supported them. In early Roman times, during the war against the Parthians, collections of love stories and licentious books were found with Roman soldiers by Surena, the Parthian general, after Crassus had been killed.[2] The Roman governor Piso under Tiberius carried corruption among the legions to such a point, according to Tacitus, that in the language of the rabble he was known as "the father of the legions."[3] He carried that corruption by bounties and bribery, by attention to the humblest private, by permitting indolence in the camps, license in the towns, and by leaving in the country a vagrant and riotous soldiery.[4]

Fronto described the Syrian soldiers as mutinous, disobedient, straying in front of their posts, roving about like scouts, tipsy from one day to the next (de meridie ad posterum temulenti).[5] The soldiers at Antioch, according to Fronto, were wont to spend their time applauding actors and were more often found in the nearest café-garden than in the ranks; their horses were shaggy from neglect, but every hair from their riders was plucked.[6] In this description, it must be remembered that Fronto was flattering Lucius Verus and exaggerating the weakness of that army, to show the merit of Verus in winning the Parthian war. On

---

[1]Appian xi. 16.

[2]Plutarch's Lives Crassus 32.

[3]Tacitus Annals ii. 55.

[4]Ibid.

[5]Fronto, op. cit., II, 208.

[6]Ibid. p. 148.

the other hand, the condition of the Syrian soldiers was a part of the general picture of indiscipline and rapacity of the soldiers in the whole empire.[1]

Marcus Aurelius spoke of the soldiers indulging wholesale in hot baths, and dissolved in luxury. He appointed Avidius Cassius, known for his strictness, to discipline them, and his prefect approved him because Cassius will be salutary for these "Graecianized soldiers."[2] Severus Alexander later in the third century found the soldiers using their leisure in baths and other pleasures. They even attempted a mutiny because he punished some of them.[3] In the fourth century, Julian found serious defects in the army in general. Instead of war songs, he found effeminate ditties among the soldiers; their beds were of feathers; they had folding couches, and they looked for houses of marble.[4] The same Julian, however, allowed his soldiers to drink and feast on the meat of his numerous sacrifices in Antioch.[5]

The Truth about the Character of the Antiochenes

We are aware that we have not exhausted the study of all the aspects of the character of the Antiochenes; but that was not our intention. We wanted to study the most characteristic manifestations of their character and those in which they were the

---

[1]Tacitus Histories ii. 86 on indiscipline under Vitellius; Suetonius Julius i. 70 on indiscipline under Caesar; C. Dio lxxiv. 11 on indiscipline at the end of the second century A.D. in Rome.

[2]Gallicanus Avidius Cassius 5 in SHA; Fronto, op. cit., II, 306. The use of the term "Graecianized soldiers" by the prefect is significant because the luxury, effeminacy, and dissoluteness of the army were taken to be influences of Greek manners.

[3]Lampridius Severus Alexander 53 in SHA.

[4]Ammianus xxii. 4. 6.

[5]Ammianus xxii. 12. 6.

most bitterly criticized. It becomes evident after this study, that different circumstances have contributed to make of the character of the people of Antioch a dark picture, which does not correspond much to the truth. In the first place, the satire of Julian and the homilies of Chrysostom and other church fathers gave a distorted aspect of the Antiochenes and their character. We have explained the circumstances and the motives of Julian's invective. We have shown likewise that the church fathers meant to exhort the people and safeguard them against what they considered sin. In so doing, they emphasized certain aspects of social life and made them look extravagant and unusually bad, because they meant at the same time to attack the institutions of pagan Hellenism. Thus, the Antiochenes were condemned to bear the weight of a double attack directed by Julian and the pagan Hellenists after the fourth century because they had become Christians, and by the church fathers because they still participated in the institutions of pagan Hellenism.

In the second place, certain modern writers to whom we have referred in appropriate occasions, have accepted those writings literally without examining the conditions and the spirit in which they were written. They not only reproduced them, but gave them more emphasis. They also picked up all other testimonies connected with the behavior of the people and which often represented the point of view of the rulers as against the ruled, and without examining the circumstances which gave rise to them, they separated them from their context and based on them broad and dangerous generalizations.

The truth, as far as we can see it, is that the Antiochenes were neither as fickle, satiric, and riotous, nor as pleasure-loving, dissolute, and immoral as they have been portrayed; and

when they at moments were really such as they have been described--whether to a greater or to a smaller degree--different causes made them act and look as they did. First and foremost were the conditions of rule and the example of the rulers, with their quarrels and rivalries, corruption and worthlessness, scandals and vices. Second, the nature of the city as we have described it in our first chapter: political and military capital of the Seleucids and of the Roman East, close to the events and easily affected by them, jealous of its autonomy, spoiled by privileges and favors from kings and emperors, rich and prosperous on the whole because of its situation, center of Hellenism and Christianity, and witness of the struggle between them.

Thus, the character of the people took really the aspect imposed on it by the conditions of rule and by the nature of the city. When the Antiochenes were fickle and riotous, they were led to be so by these conditions, and similarly when they appeared to be pleasure-loving and dissolute. They had become in course of time what their rulers made them, but the "palm in the dissoluteness of morals" as Mommsen says, does not belong to them. We have seen that they were, if not better, not worse than the people of the other great cities of their age. They fall within the general cadre of the whole picture afforded by the Hellenistic-Roman world, whether in Europe, or in Asia and Africa. They are a part of an ensemble composed of the Hellenistic and Roman monarchs and their subjects. Their vices are common to all; hence, we consider that such modern writers as have spoken of "Oriental fickleness," "effeminate Orientals," and "follies of the East" have blundered. The great mistake of these writers, it seems to us, is that they have made, in portraying the character of the Antiochenes, a double divorce. They divorced on the one hand the testimonies of

ancient writers from their context and from the circumstances and the events that went with them. On the other hand, they divorced the behavior of the people of Antioch and their character from the times and the world in which they were living. They even made Antioch and its people bear the stigma of acts for which the rulers and their soldiers were alone responsible.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ancient and Medieval Authors

Ammianus Marcellinus. Ed. and trans. John C. Rolfe. Loeb Classical Library. 3 vols. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press; London: W. Heinemann, 1935-1939.

The Apocrypha. Greek and English in Parallel Columns. Ed. S. Bagster and Sons. London, 1871.

Appian. Roman History. Ed. and trans. Horace White. Loeb Classical Library. 4 vols. London: W. Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1912-1913.

Arrian. Anabasis of Alexander. Ed. and trans. E. Iliff Robson. Loeb Classical Library. 2 vols. London: W. Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1929.

Athenaeus. The Deipnosophists. Ed. and trans. C. B. Gulick. Loeb Classical Library. 7 vols. London: W. Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1927-1941.

Ausonius, Decimus Magnus. Works. Ed. and trans. Hugh G. Evelyn White. Loeb Classical Library. 2 vols. London: W. Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1919-1921.

Der Babylonische Talmud. Ed. and trans. Lazarus Goldschmidt. 9 vols. Leipzig, 1906-1933.

Baladhuri. Futūh-al-Buldān (The Conquest of the Countries). Ed. De Goeje. Leyden, 1866.

Caesar. The Civil Wars. Ed. and trans. A. J. Paskett. Loeb Classical Library. London: W. Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1914.

Cassius Dio. Roman History. Ed. and trans. Ernest Cary. Loeb Classical Library. 9 vols. London: W. Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1914-1927.

Chronicle of Edessa. Untersuchungen über die edessenische Chronik. Ed. and trans. L. Hallier, Vol. IX of Texte und Untersuchungen zu Geschichte der altchristliche Litteratur. Leipzig, 1893.

Chrysostom, John. Complete Works. Vols. XLVII-LXIV of the Patrologiae Graecae. Ed. J. P. Migne. Paris, 1859.

_____. Works. Trans. in Vols. IX-XIII of the Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. First series. Ed. Philip Schaff. New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1888-1889.

Cicéron. Oeuvres complètes. Ed. and trans. M. Nisard. Vol. II. Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1875.

Curtius, Quintus. History of Alexander. Ed. and trans. John C. Rolfe. Loeb Classical Library. 2 vols. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press; London: W. Heinemann, 1946.

Diodorus Siculus. Bibliotheca Historica. Ed. Curtius T. Fischer. Vol. V. Leipzig: Teubner, 1905.

Diogène de Laerte. Vies et doctrines des philosophes de l'antiquité suivies de la vie de Plotin par Porphyre. Trans. M. C. Zevort. Vol. II. Paris, 1847.

Eunapius. The Lives of the Philosophers and Sophists. Ed. and trans. W. C. Wright. Loeb Classical Library. London: W. Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1922.

Eusebius of Caesarea. Ecclesiastical History. Trans. Rev. Arthur Cushman McGiffert, Vol. I of the Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. 2d series. Ed. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1904.

Evagrius Scholasticus. Ecclesiastical History in The History of the Church until 594. Trans. Edward Wells. 2d ed. London, 1709.

Excerpta Historica of Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenetes. Ed. U. P. Boissevain and others. 4 vols. Berlin, 1903-1910.

Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum. Ed. Karl Müller. 4 vols. Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1868-1874.

Fronto, Marcus Cornelius. Correspondence. Ed. and trans. C. R. Haines. Loeb Classical Library. 2 vols. London: W. Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1919.

The Greek Anthology. Ed. and trans. W. R. Paton. Loeb Classical Library. 5 vols. London: W. Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1916-1918.

The Greek New Testament. Ed. Eberhard Nestle. 16th ed. New York: American Bible Society.

Herodian. History of the Roman Empire Since Marcus Aurelius. Ed. Kurt Stavenhagen. Leipzig: Teubner, 1922.

Isaac of Antioch. Homilies. Ed. Paul Bédjan. Paris, 1903.

Isocrates. The Panegyricus. Ed. and trans. G. Norlin. Loeb Classical Library. Vol. I. London: W. Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1928.

Josephus, Flavius. Complete Works. Ed. S. Naber. 6 vols. Leipzig: Teubner, 1888-1896.

_____. Complete Works. Ed. and trans. H. St.J. Thackeray and Ralph Marcus. Loeb Classical Library. 7 vols. London: W. Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1926- .

Julian. The Works of the Emperor Julian. Ed. and trans. W. C. Wright. Loeb Classical Library. 3 vols. London: W. Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1913.

Justin. Abrégé des histoires philippiques de Trogue Pompée. Ed. and trans. E. Chambry and Mme. L. Thély-Chambry. 2 vols. Paris: Classiques Garnier, 1936.

Juvenal. Satires. Ed. and trans. G. C. Ramsay. Loeb Classical Library. London: W. Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1928.

Libanius. Complete Works. Ed. Richard Foerster. 12 vols. Leipzig: Teubner, 1903-1912.

Livy. Roman History. Ed. and trans. B. O. Foster. Loeb Classical Library. 11 vols. London: W. Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1919- .

Lucian of Samosata. Works. Ed. C. Jacobitz. 3 vols. Leipzig: Teubner, 1887-1893.

_____. Works. Trans. H. W. Fowler and F. G. Fowler. 4 vols. Oxford, 1905.

Malalas, John. The Chronicle. Ed. L. Dindorf in Vol. XV of Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae. Bonn, 1831.

_____. The Chronicle. Books VIII-XVIII. Trans. Matthew Spinka and Glanville Downey. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1940.

Masūdi. Les prairies d'Or (Murūj al-Dhahab). Ed. and trans. C. Barbier de Meynard and Pavet de Courteille. 9 vols. Paris, 1861-1917.

Monumenta Talmudica. Ed. and trans. Solomon Funk and others. 5 vols. Vienna, 1913- .

Palladius. The Dialogue Concerning the Life of Chrysostom. Ed. and trans. Herbert Moore. London, 1921.

Pausanias. Description of Greece. Ed. and trans. W. H. S. Jones and H. A. Ormerod. Loeb Classical Library. 5 vols. London: W. Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1918-1935.

Philostratus, Flavius. The Lives of the Sophists. Ed. and trans. W. C. Wright. Loeb Classical Library. London: W. Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1922.

_____. The Life of Apollonius of Tyana. Ed. and trans. F. C. Conybeare. Loeb Classical Library. 2 vols. London: W. Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1912.

Photius. Bibliotheca. Ed. I. Bekker. 2 vols. Berlin, 1824-1825.

Pliny. Natural History. Ed. and trans. H. Rackham. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press; London: W. Heinemann, 1938- .

Plutarch's Lives. Ed. and trans. Bernadotte Perrin. Loeb Classical Library. 11 vols. New York: The Macmillan Co.; London: W. Heinemann, 1914-1926.

Polyaenus. Strategmata. Ed. J. Melber. Leipzig, 1887.

Polybius. The Histories. Ed. and trans. W. R. Paton. Loeb Classical Library. 6 vols. London: W. Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1922-1927.

Procopius of Caesarea. Works. Ed. and trans. H. B. Dewing. Loeb Classical Library. 7 vols. London: W. Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1914-1940.

Scriptores Historiae Augustae. Ed. and trans. David Magie. Loeb Classical Library. 3 vols. London: W. Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1921-1932.

Severus of Antioch. Homilies. Ed. and trans. R. Duval and M. Brière in Patrologia Orientalis. Ed. R. Graffin and F. Nau. Paris, 1903- .

Socrates Scholasticus. Ecclesiastical History, Vol. LXVII of the Patrologiae Graecae. Ed. J. P. Migne. Paris, 1859.

_____. Ecclesiastical History. Trans. A. C. Zenos, Vol. II of the Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. 2d series. Ed. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1890.

Sozomen. The Ecclesiastical History, Vol. LXVII of the Patrologiae Graecae. Ed. J. P. Migne. Paris, 1859.

_____. The Ecclesiastical History. Trans. Chester D. Hartranft, Vol. II of the Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. 2d series. Ed. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1890.

Stephanus of Byzantium. Ethnica. Ed. A. Meineke. Berlin, 1849.

Strabo. The Geography. Ed. and trans. Horace L. Jones. Loeb Classical Library. Vol. V. London: W. Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1928.

Suetonius. The Lives of the Caesars. Ed. and trans. John C. Rolfe. Loeb Classical Library. 2 vols. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press; London: W. Heinemann, 1946.

Suidas. Lexicon. Ed. G. Bernhardy. 2 vols. Halle, 1853.

Syrisch-Römisches Rechtsbuch aus dem fünften Jahrhundert. Ed. and trans. K. G. Bruns and Eduard Sachau. Leipzig, 1880.

Tacitus. The Histories and the Annals. Ed. and trans. Clifford Moore and John Jackson. Loeb Classical Library. 4 vols. London: W. Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1925-1937.

Le Talmud de Jérusalem. Trans. Moïse Schwab. 11 vols. Paris, 1871-1888.

Theodoret. The Ecclesiastical History, Vol. LXXXII of the Patrologiae Graecae. Ed. J. P. Migne. Paris, 1859.

_____. The Ecclesiastical History. Trans. Rev. Blomfield Jackson, Vol. III of the Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. 2d series. Ed. Philip Schaff and H. Wace. New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1892.

_____. Religiosa Historia, Vol. LXXXII of the Patrologiae Graecae. Ed. J. P. Migne. Paris, 1859.

Velleius Paterculus. Histoire romaine. Ed. and trans. H. Hainsselin and H. Watelet. Paris: Classiques Garnier, 1932.

Wāḳidi. Futūh al-Shām (The Conquest of Syria). Vol. I. Cairo, 1899.

Yaqūt. Geographisches Wörterbuch (Mu'jam al-Buldān). Ed. F. Wüstenfeld. 6 vols. Leipzig, 1866-1873.

Zacharie le Scholastique and others. Vie de Sévère d'Antioche. Trans. M. A. Kugener, Vol. II of the Patrologia Orientalis. Ed. R. Graffin and F. Nau. Paris, 1907.

Zosimus. History. Ed. I. Bekker in Vol. XXX of Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae. Bonn, 1837.

Modern Works (Including Collections of Inscriptions)

Antioch-on-the-Orontes. Ed. George W. Elderkin and Richard Stillwell. 3 vols. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1934-1941.

Arnold, W. T. The Roman System of Provincial Administration. 3d ed. Oxford, 1914.

Babelon, Ernest. Les rois de Syrie. Paris, 1890.

Baur, P. Chrysostomus. Der Heilige Johannes Chrysostomus und seine Zeit. 2 vols. München, 1929-1930.

Beloch, Julius. Die Bevölkerung der griechisch-römischen Welt. Leipzig, 1886.

Bevan, Edwyn R. The House of Seleucus. 2 vols. London, 1902.

Bikerman, E. Institutions des Séleucides. Paris, 1938.

Bouchier, E. S. Syria as a Roman Province. Oxford, 1916.

_____. A Short History of Antioch, 300 B.C.-A.D. 1268. Oxford, 1921.

Braidwood, Robert J. Mounds in the Plain of Antioch. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1937.

British Museum Guide to the Principal Coins of the Greeks. London, 1932.

Christ, W., Schmid, W., and Stählin, O. Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur. Vol. II. Part II. 6th ed. München, 1924.

Clermont-Ganneau, C. Recueil d'archéologie orientale. Vols. III-IV. Paris, 1898-1901.

Cumont, Franz. Fouilles de Doura-Europos 1922-1923. Paris, 1926.

_____. Les religions orientales dans le paganisme romain. 4th ed. Paris, 1929.

D'Alton, F. J. Selections from St. John Chrysostom. London, 1940.

De Vogüé. Syrie centrale, architecture civile et religieuse. Paris, 1865.

Dobiaš, Josef. Histoire de la province romaine de Syrie. Prague, 1924.

Downey, Glanville. A Study of the Comites Orientis and the Consulares Syriae. Princeton, 1939.

Duncombe, John. Select Works of the Emperor Julian and Some Pieces of the Sophist Libanius with the History of the Emperor Jovian from the French of the Abbé De La Bléterie. 2 vols. London, 1784.

Dussaud, René. Topographie historique de la Syrie antique et médiévale. Paris, 1927.

Dussaud, René and Macler, F. Mission dans les régions désertiques de la Syrie moyenne. Paris, 1903.

Ferguson, William Scott. Hellenistic Athens. London, 1911.

Friedländer, Ludwig. Roman Life and Manners under the Early Empire. Trans. of 7th ed. of Sittengeschichte Roms by L. A. Magnus and others. 4 vols. London, 1908-1913.

Gibbon, Edward. The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. 2 vols. New York: The Modern Library, 1932.

Goossens, Godefroy. Hiérapolis de Syrie. Louvain, 1943.

Harrer, G. A. Studies in the History of the Roman Province of Syria. Princeton, 1915.

Head, Barclay V. Historia numorum. Oxford, 1911.

Hugi, Leo. Der Antiochikos des Libanios. Solothurn, 1919.

Jacquot, Paul. Antioche centre de tourisme. Beyrouth, 1931.

Jalabert, Louis, and Mouterde, René. Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie. 2 vols. Paris, 1929-1939.

Jones, A. H. M. The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces. Oxford, 1937.

Jouguet, Pierre. Macedonian Imperialism and the Hellenization of the East. Trans. M. R. Dobie. London, 1928.

Krumbacher, Karl. Geschichte der Byzantinischen Litteratur 527-1453. 2d ed. München, 1897.

Lévi-Provençal, E. L'Espagne musulmane au dixième siècle. Paris, 1932.

Lidzbarski, Mark. Altsemitische Texte. Giessen, 1907.

_____. Ephemeris für semitische Epigraphik. Vols. I-II. Giessen, 1902-1908.

Luckenbill, D. D. Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia. 2 vols. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1926-1927.

Mattern, Joseph. Villes mortes de Haute Syrie. 2d ed. Beyrouth, 1944.

Mommsen, Theodor. The Provinces of the Roman Empire from Caesar to Diocletian. Trans. W. P. Dickson. Vol. II. London, 1909.

Morey, C. R. The Mosaics of Antioch. New York, 1938.

Müller, C. O. Antiquitates Antiochenae. Göttingen, 1839.

Naegele, A. Chrysostomus und Libanios. Rome, 1908.

O'Leary, De Lacy. Arabic Thought and Its Place in History. London, 1939.

Pack, Roger. Studies in Libanius and Antiochene Society in the Fourth Century. Ann Arbor, 1935.

Publications of an American Archaeological Expedition to Syria in 1899-1900. Part IV Semitic Inscriptions. Ed. Enno Littmann. New York: The Century Co., 1904.

Publications of the Princeton University Archaeological Expeditions to Syria in 1904-5 and 1909. Division IV, Section B, Syriac Inscriptions by Enno Littmann. Leyden: E. J. Brill, 1934.

Renan, Ernest. The Apostles. Ed. and trans. G. W. Carleton. New York, 1866.

Répertoire d'épipraphie sémitique. Publié par la commission du Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum. Vol. I. Paris, 1900-1905.

Rogers, R. W. Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament. New York, 1912.

Rostovtzeff. M. The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World. 3 vols. Oxford, 1941.

_____. The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire. Oxford, 1926.

Rutten, M. Contrats de l'époque séleucide, Vol. XV of Babyloniaca. Paris, 1935.

Schaeffer, Claude F. A. Ugaritica. Paris, 1939.

Schultze, Victor. Antiochia, Vol. III of Altchristliche Städte und Landschaften. Gütersloh, 1930.

Stinespring, William F. "The Description of Antioch in Codex Vaticanus Arabicus 286." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Graduate School, Yale University, 1932. Pp. 31, 20, 51.

Taubenschlag, R. The Law of Graeco-Roman Egypt in the Light of the Papyri. New York, 1944.

Thompson, E. A. The Historical Work of Ammianus Marcellinus. Cambridge, 1947.

Tscherikower, V. Die hellenistischen Städtegründungen von Alexander dem Grossen bis auf die Römerzeit. Supplement Band XIX, Heft I of Philologus. Leipzig, 1927.

Welles, C. Bradford. Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period. New Haven, 1934.

Winter, John Garrett. Life and Letters in the Papyri. Ann Arbor, 1933.

Wright, F. A. A History of Later Greek Literature from the Death of Alexander to the Death of Justinian 323 B.C. - 565 A.D. London, 1932.

Wuthnow, Heinz. Die semitischen Menschennamen in griechischen Inschriften und Papyri des vorderen Orients. Leipzig, 1930.

Articles in Magazines and Encyclopaedias

Benzinger, I. "Antiocheia," Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft. Ed. Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll. First series. Vol. I, Part II, 1894.

Beurlier, E. "Le koinon de Syrie et les syriarques Artabanès et Hérode," Revue numismatique, XII (1894), 286-300.

Bowman, R. A. "Anu-Uballit-Kefalon," American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures, LVI (1939), 231-243.

_____. "Arameans, Aramaic, and the Bible," Journal of Near Eastern Studies, VII (1948), 65-90.

Cumont, Franz. "The Population of Syria," Journal of Roman Studies, XXIV (1934), 187-190.

Una descrizione araba di Antiochia. Ed. and trans. of Codex Vaticanus Arabicus 286 by I. Guidi. Rendiconti della reale accademia dei lincei. Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche, serie V, Vol. VI (1897), 137-161.

Diehl, Charles. "L'école artistique d'Antioche et les trésors d'argenterie syrienne," Syria, II (1921), 81-95.

Downey, Glanville. "Quintus Marcius Rex at Antioch," Classical Philology, XXXII (1937), 144-151.

_____. "The Work of Antoninus Pius at Antioch," Classical Philology, XXXIV (1939), 369-372.

_____. "Malalas on the History of Antioch under Severus and Caracalla," Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association, LXVIII (1937), 141-156.

_____. "The Political Status of Roman Antioch," Berytus VI (1939), 1-6.

_____. "Imperial Building Records in Malalas," Byzantinische Zeitschrift, XXXVIII (1938), 1-15.

Drexler, W. "Maiumas," Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie. Ed. W. H. Roscher. Vol. II, Part II, 1894-1897.

Durrbach, F. "Io," Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines. Ed. Daremberg and Saglio. Vol. III, Part I, 1900.

Dussaud, René. "Note additionnelle aux fouilles de Minet-el-Beida et de Ras-Shamra," Syria X (1929), 297-303.

Förster, R. "Antiochia am Orontes," Jahrbuch des kaiserlich deutschen archäologischen Instituts, XII (1897), 103-149.

Harper, George McLean, Jr. "Village Administration in the Roman Province of Syria," Yale Classical Studies, I (1928), 105-168.

Hogarth, D. G. "Antioch," Encyclopaedia Britannica. 11th ed. Vol. II, 1910.

Honigmann, E. "Syria," Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft. Ed. Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll. 2d series. Vol. IV, Part II, 1932.

Honigmann, E. and Schmid, Yohanna. "Orontes," Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft. Ed. Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll. First series. Vol. XVIII, Part I, 1939.

Howson, J. S. "Antiocheia," Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography. Ed. William Smith. Vol. I, 1878.

Kahrstedt, Ulrich. "Syrische Territorien in hellenistischer Zeit," Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, XIX (1926), 1-156.

Karalevskij, C. "Antioche," Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques. Ed. Mgr. Baudrillart. Vol. III, 1924.

Kraeling, Carl H. "The Jewish Community at Antioch," Journal of Biblical Literature, LI (1932), 130-160.

Krauss, S. "Antioche," Revue des études juives, XLV (1902), 27-49.

Leclercq, H. "Antioche," Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie. Ed. Dom Cabrol. Vol. I, Part II, 1907.

Maas, Max. "Die Maccabäer als christliche Heilige," Monatschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums, XLIV (1900), 145-156.

Metzger, Bruce. "Antioch-on-the-Orontes," The Biblical Archaeologist, XI (1948), 70-88.

Moss, C. "Homily on the Royal City," Zeitschrift für Semitistik, VII (1929), 295-306; VIII (1930), 61-72.

Müller, Albert. "Die Neujahrsfeier im römischen Kaiserreiche," Philologus, LXVIII (1909), 464-487.

Oberman, Julian. "The Sepulchre of the Maccabean Martyrs," Journal of Biblical Literature, L (1931), 250-265.

Otto, Walter. "Hellenen und Barbaren aus der Geschichte des Nationalbewusstseins," Philologische Wochenschrift, XLVI (1926), 39-46.

Perdrizet, Paul. "Inscriptions d'Antioche," Bulletin de correspondance hellénique, XXIV (1900), 289-291.

Reinach, Théodore. "L'empereur Claude et les Juifs," Revue des études juives, LXXIX (1924), 113-144.

Roussel, Pierre. "Un syrien au service de Rome et d'Octave," Syria, XV (1934), 33-74.

Seyrig, Henri. "Décret de Séleucie et ordonnance de Séleucus IV," Syria, XIII (1932), 255-258.

Smith, Sidney. "The Greek Trade at Al-Mina," The Antiquaries Journal, XXII (1942), 87-112.

Woolley, Leonard. "Excavations Near Antioch in 1936," The Antiquaries Journal, XVII (1937), 1-15.